

The Classical Review

JUNE 1889.

PHILOLOGICAL NOTES.

VII.

IN approaching the much debated question of the *v*-perfect in Latin, I start by attempting to prove that the shorter or so-called syncopated inflexions *amasti*, *amamus*, *amastis*, *amarunt* were prior to the longer *amavisti*, &c.

The statistics of the language are inconclusive. Inflexions like *amamus* were naturally avoided from their similarity to the present. To *nomus* and *consuemus* this objection does not apply. Two or three others however are quoted (*flemus* and *enarramus*), apparently with justice, which are identical with the present. The short form of the 3rd plur. is *amarunt*, never *amare*, to which its identity with the infinitive has been fatal. The other forms, *amasti*, *amastis*, *amarunt* on the one hand, *amavisti*, *amavistis*, *amaverunt* on the other, seem to have been employed with equal frequency; only at all times the shorter forms *nosti*, *nostis*, *norunt* were apparently the commoner.

The one argument I know in favour of the priority of such inflexions as *amavisti* is that contraction is a common phenomenon, and that the longer form in most cases precedes the shorter. But I have several arguments to show that the fact is otherwise in this case.

1. If the *i* of the penultimate of *amavisti* is long, as I have endeavoured to prove, then I suppose the contraction of *amavisti* into *amasti* is impossible. *Sis* for *si vis* is only in appearance an instance of such contraction. In Latin as in English (cf. *husband*) two monosyllabic words pronounced

under one accent are both shortened. In accordance with this law, as *nei sei*, *quam sei* became *nēsi*, *quāsi*, so *sei vis* passed into *sivis*. *sivis* used as an enclitic became *suis*, which gave birth to *sis*, as the pronominal *suis* or *tuis* did to *sis* or *tis*.

The facts of the language agree with the view I am taking. The radical *v* of *moveo*, *voveo* admits of absorption when the preceding vowel is a long *o*. But the only forms in which contraction takes place are those in which the *v* is followed by an admittedly short vowel—*summorunt* for *summovērunt*, *summosse*, *devōro*. It is not till the Augustan age, a time when the penultimate vowel of *movisti* was shortened, that a form like *summostis* is found.

2. The normal inflexion of the perfect of the 4th conjugation (*audivi*, *audisti*, *audivit*, *audivimus*, *audistis*, *audierunt*) confirms the doctrine that the shorter forms are the earlier, showing as it does that in the instinct of the language the *v* is properly restricted to the 1st and 3rd sing. and 1st plur.

3. The case for the priority of the shorter forms is strengthened, if we take into consideration the corresponding persons of the Sanskrit perfect, e.g. the 2nd sing. of the perfect of *jñā* (European *gnō*) is *jānātha*, which written in Latin according to the principles I have tried to establish for the formation of the Latin perfect results in *gnosti* or *nosti*. So *prā* (European *plē*) gives *paprātha* (*plesti*) and *snā* (European *nā*) gives *nasti*.

The Sanskrit plural points in the same direction, though the comparison is less ob-

vious. In Sanskrit the final vowel of verbs in *ā* (European *ā*, *ē*, *ō*) disappears in the plural of the perfect, as it does in the corresponding reduplicated perfects in Latin (*dedimus*, *stetimus*). The difference is that in Sanskrit the loss of the final vowel is restricted to the plural, and that in Latin the loss, if it takes place at all, extends, as we should expect, throughout the tense. If allowance be made for this disappearance of the final vowel in Sanskrit and for the inevitable retention of the long vowel of the singular in Latin, *jajñima*, *jajna*, *jajnus* exactly correspond to *nomus*, *nostis*, *norunt*.

It is not easy to draw Greek into comparison. The new inflexion in *κ* has spared only doubtful traces of the inherited forms of the perfect singular form-stems in *ā*, *η*, *ω* or *ᾱ*, *ε*, *ο*. Of the few words which in the plural retain the archaic form without *κ*, three are answered in Latin by reduplicated perfects, which have of course lost their final vowel—*ἔσταμεν*, *stetimus*; *ἀποδεδόανθι*, *dedērunt*; *τέτλαμεν*, *tetulimus*. The one or two other instances of the kind have no representatives in Latin. There is however a verb in *υ* which in some degree bears on the point. *πεφύασι*, which implies *πεφύμεν* and *πεφύτε*, almost requires us to hold that the earliest Latin form was *fūerunt*, and that *fūerunt* and *fūerunt* were of later origin.

The total result of these arguments amounts, I think, to a demonstration that *nostis*, *nomus*, *nostis*, *norunt* are the original inflexions of the Latin language, and that *novisti*, etc. are later and analogical expansions.

If we are justified in holding that *nostis*, *nomus*, *nostis*, *norunt* are the Latin equivalent of *jajñātha*, *jajñima*, *jajna*, *jajnus*, it surely follows that we must identify the two remaining forms *novi* and *novit* with *jajñān* (Eur. *gegnōvi*). Many scholars have shrunk from this step, mainly, I suppose, because of the absence of the sign of inflexion in Sanskrit. The absence of the vowel of inflexion after the diphthongs ending in *u* is common enough in that language. To say nothing of the isolated genitive *dyaus*, the genitives *dyos* and *gos* are recognised even in the Vedas, and so are the locatives in *-āu*. But without entering on this more general question, I can point to a similar divergence between Sanskrit on the one hand and Greek and Latin on the other in a word of another class. The Sanskrit forms for the nom. and acc. of the numeral eight are *ashta*, *ashtā*, *ashtāu* (in European letters *octō*, *octō*, *octōu*) and their variations in quantity and in ter-

mination are reflected in Greek and Latin by *ὀκτώ*, *octō*, *ὄγδοος*, *octāvus* (by Thurneysen's law for *octōvus*), and *ὀγδοήκοντα*, *octuaginta*. *ashtāu*, it will be seen, has no sign of inflexion, but the corresponding forms in Greek and Latin, *ὄγδοη* (for *ὄγδοῦ*), *octua* (for *octūva*, *octōva*) take the long plural *ā*. Following this line of comparison it is difficult to resist the belief that the Gothic *aktau* represents a European *octova* with a short plural *a*, and not *octōu*, as generally said.

The question whether in Sanskrit the *āu* of the dual as exemplified in *ashtāu* and that of the perfect were originally followed by a vowel of inflexion or not admits perhaps of profitable discussion, but for the purpose in hand it is not necessary to come to a decision. Fortified then by the parallel between *ashtāu* and *octōvā* (in *ὀγδοήκοντα*, *octuaginta*), we may safely identify *novi* and *novit* with *jajñāu*, and we may assume the early Latin inflexion to have been *novi*, *novi*, *novit*, *nomus*, *nostis*, *norunt*.

The insertion of *v* is restricted in Sanskrit to verbs ending in *ā* (Europ. *ā*, *ē*, *ō*). The Latin use is of course wider but, so far as it agrees with the Sanskrit, I have little to remark. *-evi* belongs properly only to disyllabic perfects; one, *neo*, certainly had the root-vowel long, as is shown by the Attic *νῆν*, the others may in some cases owe their long *e* to the later rule as to disyllabic perfects. *Deleo*, which is compounded of *de* and *oleo* (*ὤλεσα*), sounded in the popular ear as coming from *de* and *leo*, *leo* following the attraction of other disyllables, made *levi*. *Deleo* carried *aboleo* with it, and *aboleo* in its turn influenced its homonym *adolesco*. *-evi* with an Indo-European *o* should by Thurneysen's law become *-āvi*. But in *novi* the *ō* persists by reason of the predominance of the present. The law exercises its influence unchecked in *strāvi* for *strōvi* from the root *strō*, the present *sterno*, which ultimately stands for *strōnō*, not being in the way. After *i* and probably after *u* the employment of *v* is optional, after *au* or *av* it is necessary. Havet (*Mém. de la Soc. Ling.*, Vol. vi. p. 39) explains how *lāvi*, *mōvi*, etc. stand for *lay-vi*, *moy-vi*, etc. Besides the seven or eight recognised perfects of this type, it seems not impossible that Latin possessed another which has escaped notice in *aravi*. *Apovpa* implies a stem *āpov*, which would in Latin become *arāvo* with a perfect *arāvi*. *Aravo* on this hypothesis passed into *aruo*, and then as too unlike the perfect was displaced by a new present *aro* and disappeared, leav-

ing behind it a derivative in *armentum* for *arumentum*.

If we assume the correctness of this origin of *lāvi*, the perfect must at one time have run *lāvi*, *lāvisti*, *lāvit*, *lāvinus*, *lāvisti*, *lāverunt*. The language extended the long vowel probably first to *lāvinus* to avoid confusion between the 1st plural of the present and perfect, and then with its characteristic pursuit of uniformity to the remaining persons. This step was of importance in the history of the Latin perfect for two reasons. On the one hand it was one of the four or five factors which went to create the rule that the penult of a disyllabic perfect is long; on the other it supplied the analogy which spread the *v* from the 1st and 3rd sing. to the other persons of the perfect. There was a pressing necessity to discriminate *amamus* of the perfect from *amamus* of the present, and the relation of *lāvi*, *lāvit* to *lāvinus* naturally gave *amāvinus* as the substitute. In the 2nd pers. sing. and plur. and in the 3rd plur. there was no confusion to avoid, and analogy did its work slowly and without certainty.

As Osthoff has shown at length, *v* is also inserted in the perfect of stems ending in *ā* and *ē*, but the resulting *āvi* and *ēvi* (for *ēvi*) as coming in an unaccented syllable are changed to *ui*. The examples he cites are *domui* for *domāvi* (cf. *δομάτος*), *genui* for *genevi*, *genovi* (cf. *γενέτης*), and *vomui* for *vomevi*, *vomovi* (cf. *ἐμέτος*).

The instances of *āvi* from stems which can be shown etymologically to have ended in a short *a* are rare. I venture to suggest that one has been generally overlooked—*dāvi* from *do* in *concredui*. If this hypothesis be tenable, *duim*, which the grammarians gloss with *dederim*, is a perfect optative of the same formation as the Oscan *sefacid*. The analogous future perfect is *duo*, found in the Plautine *interduo* and *concreduo*. The words are ordinarily alleged to be presents, but, if any one will consult the texts in which they occur, he will see that, whatever the tense of them may be, in meaning at least they are future.

It perhaps deserves remark with view to a future discussion that in the instinct of the language all the trisyllabic verbs in *eo* have a short vowel, excepting those I have mentioned in connection with *deleo*.

As after *i*, so after *z*, *v* is inserted by way of alternative in the perfect, and the *zvi* thus formed, like *āvi* and *ēvi*, passes into *ui*. But to this point I will return in the last part of this article.

But the inflexion *ui* not only applies to stems in *ā*, *ē*, and *i*, but has become the normal termination of all non-reduplicated perfects with a short penultimate from stems ending in a consonant. How did this come to pass? How did *colei*, *colimus*, for example, pass into *coluei*, *coluimus*? The question once asked is, I think, not difficult to answer. On the one hand, according to the principles I have tried to prove, the perfect of *habeo* was in early times inflected *habuei*, *habeisti*, *habueit*, *habeimus*, *habeistis*, *haberunt*. *Habeimus* from its too great likeness to *habemus* of the present had to disappear, being displaced by *habuimus* which stood to *habueit* in the same relation as *amāvinus* to *amaveit*. With this change the original form of the perfect had, I imagine, some permanence. On the other hand the original form of the perfect of *colo* after the reduplication had been lost was *colei*, *coleisti*, *coleit*, *colimus*, *coleistis*, *colerunt*. If the language desired, as it must have done, to discriminate *colimus* in the present and in the perfect, it was an obvious step for the one scheme of inflexion to borrow the termination *-uimus* from the other with which it had already three endings in common. This done, a complete identification of the two paradigms must soon have ensued. The force which spread the *v* of *amāvi* through all persons of the perfect ultimately did the same for the *u* of *monui* and *colui*.

In perfects with a long penultimate the termination *ui* was sometimes employed to distinguish not the perfect and the present, but two perfects externally identical but of different meaning. There is a clear case of this use in *texui* as compared with *texi*.

But the desire to differentiate perfects of identical form was, it seems, not felt in most cases till *ei* had become monophthongic and inflexions like *monuisti* had given way to *monuisti* &c. Thus when it was required to distinguish *incessi* (*incesso*) from *incessi* (*incedo*), the sole analogy which the language had at its command lay in the shorter 2nd person of the fourth conjugation and *incessivi* was created bearing the same relation to *incessisti* as *audivi* to *audisti*. *Arcesso*, *facesso*, *lacesso*, and *capesso* naturally followed sooner or later the example of *incesso*. But the lateness of the change and the weakness of the analogy are shown by the continued existence of the older perfects side by side with the new.

In connection with the perfects in *ui* for *zvi*, I have a few remarks to offer on the

verbs formed from the reduced root with the suffix *io*. There are some thirty verbs in Latin which we know from various considerations to have been members of this class. Some belong to the fourth conjugation, as *fulcio*, *farcio*, *aperio*, *salio*, *venio*, but most belong to the third. All that are quadrisyllables or have a long antepenultimate are in the fourth, but all that belong to the third have a short antepenultimate and are trisyllabic. This fact easily explains the main peculiarity of their conjugation. The present must have originally run *capio*, *capies*, *capiet*, *capiomus* or *capiemus*, *capietis*, *capiont* and after contraction *capio*, *capis*, *capit*, *capimus*, *capitis*, *capunt*, thus being identical with the 4th conjugation, except in the 1st sing. and 3rd plur. But by the law relating to iambic words *capis* and *capit* passed into *capis* and *capit*, and a new scheme thus came into being—*capio*, *capis*, *capit*, *capimus*, *capitis*, *capunt*. In most iambic words the length of the final has been restored by some external analogy. In this case the stability of the shortened *i* was assured by at least three supports: 1. the number and frequency of the persons in which short *i* occurred. 2. the inferiority in number of the verbs such as *fulcio*, *fulcis*, which suggested an opposing analogy. 3. but above all the contrast of *audio*, *audis*, *audet*. The shortening of the middle syllable of *capimus*, *capitis* would inevitably follow not merely from the Latin love of a uniform vocalisation but as completing the opposition between *capio* and *audio*. This opposition in fact amounted to a feeling that the *i* must be either uniformly long or uniformly short throughout the tense. To conform to this instinct the present of verbs with a long antepenultimate, *fulcio*, *fulcis*, *fulcit*, *fulcimus*, *fulcitis*, *fulciunt*, simply lengthened the middle vowel of *fulcio* and *fulciunt* and thus passed into the 4th conjugation.

That the transition of the trisyllabic verbs with a short antepenultimate into the 3rd conjugation is due to the iambic form of the 2nd and 3rd sing. is almost conclusively proved by such an instance as that of *pario*. *Pario* as a simple verb belongs to the 3rd conjugation, but its compound *reperio*, *comperio*, which from their divergence of meaning were felt as independent of their parent, have passed into the fourth. So *ario* which has perished must have belonged to the 3rd,

but *aperio* and *operio*, which have lived on as independent verbs, have behaved like *comperio* and *reperio*. Even in more obviously compounded verbs traces of the same difference may be found, such as *percipit* in Plautus as opposed to the universal *capit*. There are three or four verbs belonging to the 4th conjugation which on the principle here laid down should have come under the 3rd—*venio*, *salio*, *sario*. *Venio* seems to owe its long *i* to its constant association with *is*; *salio*, etc., to contrast with the household word *sallere*, *salere*; *sarire*, if indeed it is always to be spelt with a single *r*, belongs at all events to the rustic language, which seems not to have dealt with this class of verbs in accordance with the same laws that governed the Latin of the city.

The fact that *pator*, *orior*, *morior*, belong at least in part to the 3rd conjugation goes to prove that the active forms of these verbs existed in early Latin; we know that this is so in the case of *pator* and *orior* and may reasonably suspect the same to be true of *morior*.

The few verbs in *io* which either had lost or never possessed a traditional perfect, formed (1) by reduplication, (2) by the addition of *si* to the stem, or (3) by lengthening the root-vowel, constructed a new perfect in *ii*, or, with an optional insertion of *v*, in *ivi*. This *ivi* in an unaccented syllable necessarily passed into *ui*, and in this shape became the ordinary classical termination. Thus *sapio* had for its perfect in early times (1) *sapīi*, *sapui*, (2) *sapīsti*, (3) *sapīit*, *sapīit*, (4) *sapimus*, or by an early modification *sapūimus*, (5) *sapīstis*, (6) *sapīere* or *sapūere*. *Sapīsti*, *sapimus*, and *sapīstis* from their identity in form with *audisti*, etc., naturally gave birth to a third alternative form *sapīvi*. So *rapio* gives birth to *rapui* (for *rapīvi*) and *lacio* to *elicui*. This mode of formation applied even to those verbs which eventually joined the 4th conjugation, though their natural preference was for the perfect in *ivi*. *Aperio* and *operio* make *aperui*, *operui*; *amicio*, *amicui*, and *amicisse*; from *salio* all three forms are found, *salii*, *salui*, and *salivi*; from *sario* two, the early *sarui* and the later *sarivi*. *Pono* is yet another instance of a perfect in *ii* with both alternative variations, *posui*, *posui*, and *posivi*.

FRED. W. WALKER.

VERISIMILIA NONIANA.

XXVI. 2. *Lucilius, lib. xvi.* :

Conpernem aut ueram fuisse Amfitreonis
ἀκοῦτον

*Alcmenam atque alias? * * ipsam denique*
nolo

dicere ; tute uide atque disullabon elige
quoduis.

xvi. H² P V, xvii. F H¹ L, with most editors. I would prefer xvi. as, in the first three books of Nonius, where H² P V are opposed to F H¹ L, they are right in a large majority of cases. *nlenam ipsam* (sic) F¹, *menam* i. L¹, *lenam* i. F² H L² P V. The state of the MSS. obliges us to carry out Lucilius' injunction and select *disullabon quoduis*. Scaliger suggested *Helenam*, but *Helenam* is *trisullabon*, not *disullabon*, and therefore it would seem out of court. Editors generally adopt *Ledam*, but why should Lucilius object to mention Leda more than Alcmena, and why should he say '*ipsa Leda*,' as though she were in a different category to the other ladies, whose names he introduces? Should we not rather read *Heram ipsam*? Lucilius may well have scrupled to speak disrespectfully of the goddess, *quae diuom incedit regina, Iouisque et soror et coniux*, and her name, as the climax of all things, would naturally be introduced with *ipsa*. It has also occurred to me as possible that Lucilius himself omitted the word, leaving the *disullabon* to be supplied by the imagination of his readers. *Menam* &c. may be a dittography of the last two syllables of *Alcmenam*.

LXVI. 25. *Varro* (fr. 589 Bueh.) *Quid mirum? ex agri depolitionibus eiciuntur; hic in cenaculo polito recipiuntur.* So Buecheler with all the MSS. (F H L P V), except F¹, which omits *in*. It is difficult to make satisfactory sense of the passage as it stands. Lucian Müller suggests '*Quid uero? ex agri politionibus deiciuntur; hic in cenaculo polito recipiuntur,*' an arbitrary and violent change, which moreover hopelessly obscures what seems to be the obvious meaning of the words. The situation is surely this. An unfortunate agriculturist (one of Verres' victims ?) has been ejected from his holding, and has to take refuge in a sorry garret in the town, at which he not unnaturally complains. 'And no wonder they complain,' says Varro, 'they are ejected from the holdings they have furnished so carefully (*depolitionibus*), and are welcomed here to the hospitality of an unfurnished garret.' Read *cenaculo inpolitio* for *in cenaculo polito*

and the sense required is at once procured. The passage may perhaps come from the *Papia papae, περὶ ἐγκωμίων*: cf. Non. xxvi. 22. Bueh. Sat. Men. frag. 378.

LXXVII. 20. *Pacuius Medo* (Ribb. Trag. 227):

'Si resto porgit ut eam; si ire conor prohibet
bêtere.'

So Ribbeck. The MSS. (F H L P V) have *pergitur eam*, for which I would suggest *pergit uiam*; *pergit ui* was written *pergitur*, and *am* corrected to *eam*. The line will then be a trochaic septenarius, and will run:

'Si resto pergit uiam; si ire conor, prohibet
bêtere.'

CXLVII. 4. *Caecilius Plocio* (Ribb. Com. 173):

'Edepol senectus, utsi nihil aliud
adpôrtes tecum, cum dduenis unum id sat
est.'

This is the reading of all the MSS. of Nonius, including the group of extract MSS. The passage also occurs, Cic. *De Sen.* § 25, where the MSS. practically agree in giving *si nihil quicquam aliud uitii*. Ribbeck reads *si nil quicquam aliud uitii* with the editors of Cic., L. Mueller *etsi nil aliud uitii*. I would prefer *ut nil quicquam aliud uitii*. *Quicquam* should be genuine, as it is very difficult to see why it should have been introduced, and *ut* may well be a combination of the two readings *ut* and *si*.

CCLIII. 18. *Lucilius lib. xxvi.* :

'Nunc itidem populo istum scriptoribus,
uoluimus capere animum illorum.'

istidem H¹ G z'.

uoluimus H² L V z mg. *uolumus* H¹ P G z'.

Müller rewrites

'Nunc itidem populum aucupamur istis cum
scriptoribus
uoluimus capere animum illorum.'

I would propose to retain the MSS. reading, on the authority of Nonius himself, xxxix. 32, where we read *Populare significat populi amorem conciliare. Pacuuius Chryse* :

'Atque ut promeruit pater mihi patriam
populauit meam.

Lucilius is saying, 'I am writing now, not for scholars, but for the world in general.' 'I am trying,' he says, 'to gain the sympathy of the public for literature; my purpose is to captivate them.'

CCLV. 6. *Terentius in Phormione* (840):

Sed ostium concrépuit. Nihil ad té.

This is the reading of all the MSS. of Nonius. The line as given in all the MSS. of Terence himself runs:

'Set ostium concrépuit abs te. Vide quis egreditúr. Getast.'

Mercier and Quicherat get over the difficulty by the simple expedient of altering *nihil ad te* to *abs te*. Müller retains *nihil ad te* and proposes to omit *vide*. Now the words *crepuit a Glycerio ostium: nihil ad te* occur in the Andria, line 682, where A gives *crepuit*, BCD EGP *concrepuit*. Is it not absolutely certain that both passages originally existed in Nonius, and that the reading of the present MSS. is simply a combination of the two? I would write:—

Terentius in Phormione (840):

'Set ostium concrépuit [abs te.]

Idem in Andria (682):

'Concrepuit a Glycerio ostium.]

Nihil ad te.'

CCLVI. 18. *Accius Eurysace* Ribb. Trag. (371):

'Nihil est; si autem ad té retardat, sócium in portu est cópia
quae subsistat; modo tute ipse te effirma et conpara.'

This is practically the reading of all the MSS. except V¹, which has *retardat*. Editors vary between *ad te res tardat*, *adire tardat*, and *ad te ire tardat* in the first line, and *tete offirma* and *te confirma* in the second. I am inclined to believe that the *retardat* of V¹ is nearest to the original reading, and propose

'Nihil est; si autem ad te ire tarder, sócium in portu est cópia
quae subsistat; módo tute ipse té confirma et cónpara.'

Retardat is much more likely to have become *retardat* than *vice versa*, and the form *tardat* may well be due to a confusion of two readings, *tardor* and *tarder*. The alliteration with *conpara* seems to recommend *te confirma* (*te é firma*) in preference to *tete offirma* or *tete firma*.

CCLXI. 11. *Cernere, audire. Accius in Chrysippo* (Ribb. Trag. 268):

'Quid agam? uox illius est certe idem omnes cernimus.'

Editors generally write the line as an iambic senarius,

'Quid agám? uox illiust certe idem omnes cernimus.'

supposing a change of persons either before or after *certe*. The meaning to be

attached to *idem* is however far from obvious. Should not the line be written as a trochaic septenarius?—

'Quid agam? uox illius est certe. Id [quid]em omnes cernimus.'

CCLXVII. 25. *Censere, suscensere. Varro, Caprino proelio*, περί ἡδονῆς (72 Buech):

'Ne uobis censeam, si ad me referretis.' Editors seem generally to suppose that *censeam* is a mistake for *suscenseam* (§ *censeam*). Surely however it is much more probable that the reference is to the common phrases *referre ad senatum* and *patres censuere*. The speaker puts himself in the position of the senate, and says, 'You had better not ask me, for fear I may state my views too plainly, should you consult my opinion.'

CCLXXIV. 19. *Conducere, conuenire. Lucilius lib. xxx.*:

'E uirtute tua et claris conducere chartis.'

This is the reading of B, the other MSS. have *et uirtute*. Müller gives:

'Et uirtute tuac et caris conducere chartis.'

Why should any change be made? The line makes excellent sense as it stands, if we suppose *esse uidetur* or some similar phrase to have preceded: 'It seems to be in accordance with your merits, and appropriate to your noble writings.'

Ch. 21. *Conducere, utile esse (Lucilius)*:

'Sólus uero sólí quid re et quáestu conducát suo.'

Müller writes:

'Sólus uero scít quid re atque quáestu conducát suo,'

a very bold and violent emendation. Admirable sense is obtained by writing *scio* for *suo*, which two words are confused again and again in the MSS. of Nonius.

CCLXXVII. 27. *Titinius Proelia* (Ribb. Com. 82):

'Tibin égo mediam quám sciam non délicem?'
Tibi nego mediam H¹ G Z¹, tibine comoediam H² L P V Z², quam H² L² V, quem H¹ P G Z, que L¹. Many alterations have been suggested, but the line scans and construes as it stands. Translate: 'Am I not to point out the woman whom I know to have acted as go-between?'

CCXCVI. 7. *Plautus in Asinaria* (247):

'Dígnos [indígnós] adire atque éxperiri certum ést mihi.'

So the MSS. of Nonius and Plautus, except that those of Nonius omit *indígnos*. Goetz and Loewe unite

'*Dignos indignós adire prēcibus decretūmst mihi.*'

arguing that *experiar* occurs in line 245 and *certum est* in line 248. May it not fairly be urged that the repetition is just what might be expected under the circumstances, and really in favour of the genuineness of the words? *Argyrippus* is very much in love, and very much afraid that some one else will carry off the girl he loves, and would not be likely to think and speak with strict logical accuracy and precision. I would write:

'*Dignos [indignós] adibo atque experiar certum est mihi.*'

The hypotactic construction of the infinitive with *certum est* seems to occur about five times as often in Plautus as the paratactic construction with the future. In Terence the infinitive seems to be the only construction used. Thus in MSS. the commoner infinitive would be very likely to oust the rarer future.

CCC. 24. *Lucilius lib. xxviii.*

Ibi erat scopiose

eciere istum abs te quamprimum et perdere amorem.

Ubi V, ibi H L P G Z B, scopiose H¹ P G Z B, scopios H² L V, eicere H¹ P V² G Z B, eiecere H² L V¹. Many emendations have been suggested, but none seems to be convincing. Is *scopiose* a corruption of *speciose*? *Suspicio* and *suspicio* and similar words are constantly confused in MSS.

CCCII. 29. *Varro, Proelio Caprino, περὶ ἡδονῆς.* '*Non posses eam amplius perferre; tamen suadet ut notat.*'

Non posses se amplius H¹ G Z¹, non posse se amplius B, te H² L P V Z² ut om H¹ O C T B. The reading of the first part is very uncertain. Editors vary between *posse se*, *posse se eam*, and *posses eam*. Perhaps on the whole it is safer to follow the majority of MSS. in reading *posses eam*. For *ut notat*, *aut notat*, *ut noceat*, and *et uocat* have been proposed. Müller as usual cuts the knot and reads *sudat ut potat*. I would suggest *suadet*, *notat*, explaining the *ut* as due to a correction of *notat* to *uocat*. The reference seems to be to pleasure. 'You could not possibly,' you say, 'tolerate her any longer' still she persuades you *facere* τὸ ἡδὺν and forbids you *facere* τὸ λυπηρόν.

CCCV. 13. *Plaut. Mil. Glor. (IV. 8, 12):*

'*Nam tu quamvis potissis facere ut fluat facetiis.*'

Tu om. L¹, quamvis V¹ B, quemvis H L P V² G, fetiis H¹ G B; the MSS. of Plautus *quamvis potis es* (or *est*). Editors generally seem to adopt *afuat* or *atfuat*, which however spoils the alliteration. I would prefer to introduce the ordinary comic phrase *facile facere* and write, keeping up the alliteration with *f*,

'*Nam tu quamvis potis sis [facile] facere ut fluat facetiis.*'

J. H. ONIONS.

ΥΠΑΡΝΟΣ.

I wish to draw attention to a strange and somewhat amusing mistake respecting this word, which, with the tendency of any tradition to fix itself, has held ground, no one can say how long, in lexicons and editions. The article in 'Liddell and Scott' runs thus: '*ὑπαρνος, ov, with a lamb under it, i.e. suckling a lamb, or (metaphorically) a babe, Eur. Andr. 557, Call. Apoll. 53; cf. ὑπόρρηνος.*' It is true, and might have been fairly assumed without express evidence, that Greek was capable of the compound *ὑπαρνος* in the sense given. But it is also true that this is not the only meaning of it, and that in the example from Euripides this meaning has only an indirect bearing upon the use of the word.

The passage occurs where the aged Peleus arrives on the scene just in time to prevent

the killing of Andromache and her child Molossus by Menelaus, who has taken advantage of Neoptolemus' absence to wreak the hatred of Hermione, daughter of Menelaus and wife of Neoptolemus, against her husband's slave and mistress. Peleus as representing his absent grandson, questions Andromache thus:—

εἰπὲ, τίνι δίκῃ, χέρας
βρόχοισιν ἐκδήσαντες, οἷδ' ἀγούσι σε
καὶ παῖδ'; ὑπαρνος γάρ τις ὡς ἀπόλλυσσαι,
ἡμῶν ἀπόντων, τοῦ τε κυρίου σέθεν.

It is manifest at a glance that, whatever else *ὑπαρνος* may here mean, part of its meaning must be that which the speaker himself assigns in express words. 'You are,' he says, '*like one ὑπαρνος in being put to death without the presence of me or my*

family and particularly of your rightful master.' The form of the period forbids us to cut it into two pieces without any connexion of meaning. The condition ἡμῶν ἀπόντων τοῦ τε κυρίου explains the preceding question, *τίνι δίκῃ*, by *what right?* Unless ἵπαρος denotes this condition and expresses it in another form, it has, as placed in this period, no relevance at all. It is also, I submit, plain enough that ἵπαρος does describe the condition, and in what manner. As used here, it is derived primarily from the stem not of ἄρνα but of ἀρνέσθαι (cf. ἄπαρος—ἀπαρνοῦμαι), and signifies 'a protester to the jurisdiction, one who puts in a rejection of a tribunal, as a bar to its proceeding': for the force of the compounded preposition compare ἐπ-ωμοσία.

This much seems to me obvious: but there remains the question whether the other possible meaning of ἵπαρος is here to be neglected. I think not. Neither in the general tone of the *Andromache*, nor in the character of the old Peleus, is there anything

to make us hesitate in attributing to him a jest. The use of ἵπαρος here is a jest. The substance of his question is contained in the words—

εἰπέ τίνι δίκῃ χέρας
βράχουσιν ἐκδήσαντες οἷδ' ἀγούσι σε
ἡμῶν ἀπόντων τοῦ τε κυρίου σέθεν;

'Upon what claim do they thus take possession of your person in the absence of your owner?' This question naturally suggests to him the word ἵπαρος in its legal sense; and, his eye falling at the moment upon the boy Molossus (who by the way is no 'suckling' and only so styled here for the sake of the jest), he remarks parenthetically that with her lamb at her side *Andromache* looks as if she were actually putting in her protest against the usurpation of her tormentors. The best punctuation to express the point would be to mark καὶ παῖδ', ἵπαρος γάρ τις ὥς ἀπόλλυσαι as a parenthesis, and place the note of interrogation after σέθεν.

A. W. VERRALL.

THE AGENT IN THE ATTIC ORATORS.

I.

ANTIPHON AND ANDOCIDES.

SINCE Shilleto wrote 'in tironum gratiam' that 'the more usual construction after passive perfects is the dative,' nothing has been done, so far as I am aware, towards examining the various ways in which the agent is expressed in Greek and reducing the results to order. My main purpose is to discover the statistics for ὑπό and the dative respectively after the perfect of passive and intransitive verbs in the Orators: at the same time, it seems worth while to set down the facts, as far as they call for notice, with regard to other constructions of the agent. At present, I confine myself *entirely* to the two earliest orators, neither affirming nor denying that the conclusions drawn hold in the case of any other author.

1. ὑπό with things after passive and intrans. verbs. This construction is remarkably frequent in Antiphon, occurring twenty-seven times; it is found once in Andocides. The thing which takes the place of a personal agent is always *external* to the person affected; thus such expressions as ὑπὸ δέους ἀναγκάζεσθαι do not occur.

Hence Ant. Tet. A. α, 8 has διαφθαρήναι ὑπὸ τῆς γραφῆς, and ib. Γ. γ, 5, δ. ὑπ' ἀθεραπείας, but in Γ. β, 6 he writes τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἀβουλῇ διέφθαρται, and in 5 § 5, ἀπειρία μᾶλλον ἢ ἀδικία ἡμαρτήσθαι, ἀληθεία μᾶλλον ἢ δεινότητι εἰρησθαι. In ten cases, the thing in the gen. with ὑπό is coupled or contrasted with a *personal* agent; so that, as contrasted with the instrumental dat., the gen. with ὑπό represents the thing as *directly* bringing about the result described in the verb. Thus in Ant. 5 § 35, τοῖς λόγοις τοῖς ἐψευσμένοις ὑπ' ἐκείνων . . . ἐγὼ ἀπόλλυμαι, whereas grammar would allow ὑπὸ τῶν λόγων τῶν ἐψευσμένων ἐκείνῳ instead of this (below, 2, b), the effect would be marred by this change, the speaker's object being to represent the slave and those who put the slave to death, and not the lies told by the slave, as directly responsible for the danger in which he was himself placed. The verbs used with this construction are verbs of (a) *perishing* (ἀπολέσθαι, διαφθαρήναι, ἀποθανεῖν), (b) *condemning, acquitting* (ἐξελέγχεσθαι, κατακρίνεσθαι, καταλαμβάνεσθαι, ἀπολύεσθαι), (c) of *inducing, forcing* (πείθεσθαι, ἀναγκάζεσθαι, βιάζεσθαι), (d) *poning*.

2. The agent with the perfect passive or perfect of an intransitive verb. (a) If the

subject acted upon is a *person*, *ὑπό* and the *gen.* is always used, *never* the dative. There are seven instances in Antiphon, including 5 § 39, *τεβνέωτα ὑπ' ἐμοῦ*, and frag. x. *πέπονθα ὑπὸ τούτου*. The others are *Tet. A.* α, 6; B. γ, 12, and δ, 4; 6 § 34, frag. xxi. Andocides gives four examples, including *de Pac.* § 23, *πεπονθότες ὑφ' ἡμῶν*. The others are *de Myst.* §§ 25, 101, 113. (b) Next come the cases in which the subject acted upon is *impersonal*. In these, Antiphon uses the dative in twelve cases, *viz.* with *πέπρακται* (twice), *πεπραγμένος* (twice), *ἡμάρτηται* or *ἐξ-* (thrice), *μεμηχάνηται*; *ἐίρηται*, *ἐπιδέδεκται*, *δεδούρηται*, *βεβροθήηται*. This construction appears in Andocides fourteen times, with *πέπρακται*, *πεπραγμένος* (thrice), *πεποιήται*, *πειποιημένος*, *ἡμάρτηται* (four times), *ἡσέβηται*; *ἀποδεδεκται*, *ἀπολελόγηται*, *μεμύνηται*. The other details which require remark are the following: firstly, these verbs all show clearly the ethic force underlying the 'dative of the agent'; and secondly, the verbs used all belong to one or other of two groups, *viz.* to *πράττω*, and words of similar meaning, or to *λέγω*, and words of similar meaning; for with *βεβροθήηται* we must supply *τῷ λόγῳ* (*Ant.* 1 § 31). In Andoc. *de Pace*, § 12, *ἡμῖν... γέγραπται*, the dat. appears to be purely ethic. The dat. then is found in twenty-six places, and in all the verbs are akin to *πράττω* or *λέγω*.

There remain three passages in which *ὑπό* and the *gen.* is used, the subject being impersonal. *Ant. Tet. A.* δ, 10 has *τὰ ἔχρη τοῦ φόβου οὐκ εἰς ἐμὲ φέροντα ἀλλ' εἰς τοὺς ἀπολομένους ἀποδεδεκται ὑπ' αὐτῶν*, and in 5 § 35, *τοῖς δὲ λόγοις τοῖς ἐψευσμένοις ὑπ' ἐκείνων ὡς ἀλήθεσιν οὖσιν ἐγὼ ἀπόλλυμαι*, while in And. *de Myst.* § 56 we find *οὔτε μετὰ κακίας οὔτε μετ' ἀνανδρίας οὐδεμῶς τῶν γεγενημένων πέπρακται ὑπ' ἐμοῦ οὐδέν*. Are we to suppose that *ἀποδεδεκται αὐτοῖς* is the same as *ἀποδεδεκται ὑπ' αὐτῶν*, and that Andocides had no reason but usage for writing *ἀποδεδεκται μοι ὡς οὔτε ἡσέβηκα κ.τ.λ.* (*de Myst.* § 29), rather than *ὑπ' ἐμοῦ*? Again, is *πέπρακται ὑπ' ἐμοῦ* convertible with *π. ἐμοί*? I think not. In *Ant. Tet.* l.c., there seems to be particular emphasis on *ὑπ' αὐτῶν*, as a careful reading of the whole section seems to show. 'Everything else,' says the speaker, 'proofs and probability alike, are in my favour. *They*, my opponents, have shown,' &c. Similarly Andocides (l.c.) is laying the utmost stress on himself and his own innocence. The logic, as so often, is defective, and the sentence is without balance, but there is an implied reflection upon his opponents' character. 'I have to give account of my acts in the presence of

those who were guilty. *My* object is to prove that *I* am innocent, that it is not *I* who have acted meanly.' Lastly, in *Ant.* 5 § 35, there is a rather strained contrast between *ὑπ' ἐκείνων* and *ἐγώ*, between the lies of the former, and the consequence of them to the latter. The result of the construction is to make *ὑπ' ἐκείνων*, though not grammatically, yet logically, agent to *ἀπόλλυμαι* as well as *ἐψευσμένοις*. If this interpretation of these three passages is right, *ὑπό* and *gen.* is used even with the perf. pass. of *πράττω* and *λέγω*, when a special effect is to be gained by throwing strong emphasis on the agent. Supposing this to be so, we can then see, perhaps, why Aristophanes (*Eg.* 57) writes *τὴν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ μεμαχμένην* and not *τὴν ἐμοί μ.* Great emphasis is thus laid on *ἐμοῦ*, and Demosthenes' resentment at Cleon's interference is expressed in the most vigorous language possible.

3. Antiphon *Tet. A.* δ, 1 has *τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τῶν ἐξ ἐμοῦ πραχθέντων*, where Maetzner takes *ἐκ* as for *ὑπό*, as in Ionic usage. But on comparing *Tet. B.* β, 2 and 10, *ἡ ἀλήθεια τῶν πραχθέντων*, this explanation seems open to question. Then again *Ant.* 5 § 2 says *δεῖ με σωθῆναι μετὰ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰπόντα τὰ γενόμενα*, very similar to which is And. *de Myst.* § 55.¹ The expression *τὰ ἐξ ἐμοῦ πραχθέντα* in Antiphon appears to hold a middle position between *ἡ ἀλήθεια τῶν πραχθέντων* (or *γενομένων*)—'the true nature of the facts'—and *ἡ ἀ. τῶν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ π.*: there is not the dynamic force in *ἐξ ἐμοῦ* that there is in *ὑπ' ἐμοῦ*, and *ἐξ ἐμοῦ* is not felt as the agent, but expresses the person concerned in the deeds. It may be some support to this that the defendant has to prove a negative, *i. e.* that he had taken no part at all in the murder. Thus the meaning will be no more than 'the true nature of the facts in which I am concerned,' or 'the true nature of my position.' *Ant. Tet.* B. β, 6 and γ, 10, *φόνος ἐξ ἀμφοῖν γενέσθαι*, where 'both are concerned' in the death of the one, but neither is concerned in at most more than *φόνος ἀκούσιος*, and where *ἐξ ἀμφοῖν* has not the dynamic force of *ὑπ' ἀμφοῖν*, confirms, I think, this view of the passage.

E. C. MARCHANT.

¹ Has attention been drawn to the numerous verbal similarities between *Ant. de caede Her.* and *And. de Myst.*? The external probability that the oligarch Andocides (for such I take him to have been all his life at heart) should admire the oligarch Antiphon, and, being himself in matters oratorical a layman, should use his speeches amongst other materials in preparing his own defence, is fairly supported by internal evidence; for, though there is no similarity in style between the two, there is in phraseology.

family and particularly of your rightful master.' The form of the period forbids us to cut it into two pieces without any connexion of meaning. The condition ἡμῶν ἀπόντων τοῦ τε κυρίου explains the preceding question, *τίνι δίκῃ*, by what right? Unless ἵπαρος denotes this condition and expresses it in another form, it has, as placed in this period, no relevance at all. It is also, I submit, plain enough that ἵπαρος does describe the condition, and in what manner. As used here, it is derived primarily from the stem not of ἄρα but of ἀρνεῖσθαι (cf. ἄπαρος—ἀπαρνοῦμαι), and signifies 'a protester to the jurisdiction, one who puts in a rejection of a tribunal, as a bar to its proceeding': for the force of the compounded preposition compare ἐπ-ωμοσία.

This much seems to me obvious: but there remains the question whether the other possible meaning of ἵπαρος is here to be neglected. I think not. Neither in the general tone of the *Andromache*, nor in the character of the old Peleus, is there anything

to make us hesitate in attributing to him a jest. The use of ἵπαρος here is a jest. The substance of his question is contained in the words—

εἰπὲ τίνι δίκῃ χέρας
βρόχοισιν ἐκδήσαντες οἷδ' ἄγονσίν σε
ἡμῶν ἀπόντων τοῦ τε κυρίου σέθεν;

'Upon what claim do they thus take possession of your person in the absence of your owner?' This question naturally suggests to him the word ἵπαρος in its legal sense; and, his eye falling at the moment upon the boy Molossus (who by the way is no 'suckling' and only so styled here for the sake of the jest), he remarks parenthetically that with her *lamb* at her side *Andromache* looks as if she were actually putting in her protest against the usurpation of her tormentors. The best punctuation to express the point would be to mark καὶ παῖδ', ἵπαρος γάρ τις ὥς ἀπόλλυσαι as a parenthesis, and place the note of interrogation after σέθεν.

A. W. VERRALL.

THE AGENT IN THE ATTIC ORATORS.

I.

ANTIPHON AND ANDOCIDES.

SINCE Shilleto wrote 'in tironum gratiam' that 'the more usual construction after passive perfects is the dative,' nothing has been done, so far as I am aware, towards examining the various ways in which the agent is expressed in Greek and reducing the results to order. My main purpose is to discover the statistics for ὑπό and the dative respectively after the perfect of passive and intransitive verbs in the Orators: at the same time, it seems worth while to set down the facts, as far as they call for notice, with regard to other constructions of the agent. At present, I confine myself entirely to the two earliest orators, neither affirming nor denying that the conclusions drawn hold in the case of any other author.

1. ὑπό with things after passive and intrans. verbs. This construction is remarkably frequent in Antiphon, occurring twenty-seven times; it is found once in Andocides. The thing which takes the place of a personal agent is always external to the person affected; thus such expressions as ὑπὸ δέους ἀναγκάζεσθαι do not occur.

Hence Ant. *Tet.* A. a, 8 has διαφθαρήναι ὑπὸ τῆς γραφῆς, and ib. Γ. γ, 5, δ. ὑπ' ἀθεραπείας, but in Γ. β, 6 he writes τῇ ἐαυτοῦ ἀβουλίᾳ διέφθαρται, and in 5 § 5, ἀπειρία μᾶλλον ἢ ἀδικία ἡμαρτῆσθαι, ἀληθείᾳ μᾶλλον ἢ δεινότητι εἰρησθαι. In ten cases, the thing in the gen. with ὑπό is coupled or contrasted with a personal agent; so that, as contrasted with the instrumental dat., the gen. with ὑπό represents the thing as directly bringing about the result described in the verb. Thus in Ant. 5 § 35, τοῖς λόγοις τοῖς ἐψευσμένοις ὑπ' ἐκείνων . . . ἐγὼ ἀπόλλυμαι, whereas grammar would allow ὑπὸ τῶν λόγων τῶν ἐψευσμένων ἐκείνῳ instead of this (below, 2, b), the effect would be marred by this change, the speaker's object being to represent the slave and those who put the slave to death, and not the lies told by the slave, as directly responsible for the danger in which he was himself placed. The verbs used with this construction are verbs of (a) perishing (ἀπολέσθαι, διαφθαρήναι, ἀποθνήναι), (b) condemning, acquitting (ἐξελέγχεσθαι, κατακρίνεσθαι, καταλαμβάνεσθαι, ἀποδύεσθαι), (c) of inducing, forcing (πείθεσθαι, ἀναγκάζεσθαι, βιάζεσθαι), (d) πονείν.

2. The agent with the perfect passive or perfect of an intransitive verb. (a) If the

subject acted upon is a *person*, *ὑπό* and the *gen.* is always used, *never* the dative. There are seven instances in Antiphon, including 5 § 39, *τεθνεῶτα ὑπ' ἐμοῦ*, and frag. x. *πέπονθα ὑπὸ τούτου*. The others are *Tet. A.* α, 6; B. γ, 12, and δ, 4; 6 § 34, frag. xxi. Andocides gives four examples, including *de Pac.* § 23, *πεπονθότες ὑφ' ἡμῶν*. The others are *de Myst.* §§ 25, 101, 113. (b) Next come the cases in which the subject acted upon is *impersonal*. In these, Antiphon uses the dative in twelve cases, *viz.*, with *πέπρακται* (twice), *πεπραγμένος* (twice), *ἡμάρτηται* or *ἐξ*-(thrice), *μεμηχάνηται*; *εἴρηται*, *ἐπιδεδεικται*, *δοιόγηται*, *βεβοήθηται*. This construction appears in Andocides fourteen times, with *πέπρακται*, *πεπραγμένος* (thrice), *πεποιήται*, *πεποιημένος*, *ἡμάρτηται* (four times), *ἡσέβηται*; *ἀποδεδεικται*, *ἀπολελόγηται*, *μεμύνηται*. The other details which require remark are the following: firstly, these verbs all show clearly the ethic force underlying the 'dative of the agent'; and secondly, the verbs used all belong to one or other of two groups, *viz.* to *πράττω*, and words of similar meaning, or to *λέγω*, and words of similar meaning; for with *βεβοήθηται* we must supply *τῷ λόγῳ* (*Ant. 1* § 31). In Andoc. *de Pace*, § 12, *ἡμῖν... γέγραπται*, the dat. appears to be purely ethic. The dat. then is found in twenty-six places, and in all the verbs are akin to *πράττω* or *λέγω*.

There remain three passages in which *ὑπό* and the *gen.* is used, the subject being impersonal. *Ant. Tet. A.* δ, 10 has *τὰ ἔχνη τοῦ φόνου οὐκ εἰς ἐμὲ φέροντα ἀλλ' εἰς τοὺς ἀπολομένους ἀποδεδεικται ὑπ' αὐτῶν*, and in 5 § 35, *τοῖς δὲ λόγοις τοῖς ἐφευρισμένοις ὑπ' ἐκείνου ὡς ἀλήθεσιν οὖσιν ἐγὼ ἀπόλλυμαι*, while in And. *de Myst.* § 56 we find *οὔτε μετὰ κακίας οὔτε μετ' ἀνανδρίας οὐδεμιᾶς τῶν γεγενημένων πέπρακται ὑπ' ἐμοῦ οὐδέν*. Are we to suppose that *ἀποδεδεικται αὐτοῖς* is the same as *ἀποδεδεικται ὑπ' αὐτῶν*, and that Andocides had no reason but usage for writing *ἀποδεδεικται μοι ὡς οὔτε ἡσέβηκα κ.τ.λ.* (*de Myst.* § 29), rather than *ὑπ' ἐμοῦ*? Again, is *πέπρακται ὑπ' ἐμοῦ* convertible with *π. ἐμοί*? I think not. In *Ant. Tet. l.c.*, there seems to be particular emphasis on *ὑπ' αὐτῶν*, as a careful reading of the whole section seems to show. 'Everything else,' says the speaker, 'proofs and probability alike, are in my favour. *They*, my opponents, have shown,' &c. Similarly Andocides (*l.c.*) is laying the utmost stress on himself and his own innocence. The logic, as so often, is defective, and the sentence is without balance, but there is an implied reflection upon his opponents' character. 'I have to give account of my acts in the presence of

those who were guilty. *My* object is to prove that *I* am innocent, that it is not *I* who have acted meanly.' Lastly, in *Ant. 5* § 35, there is a rather strained contrast between *ὑπ' ἐκείνου* and *ἐγὼ*, between the lies of the former, and the consequence of them to the latter. The result of the construction is to make *ὑπ' ἐκείνου*, though not grammatically, yet logically, agent to *ἀπόλλυμαι* as well as *ἐφευρισμένοις*. If this interpretation of these three passages is right, *ὑπό* and *gen.* is used even with the perf. pass. of *πράττω* and *λέγω*, when a special effect is to be gained by throwing strong emphasis on the agent. Supposing this to be so, we can then see, perhaps, why Aristophanes (*Eg.* 57) writes *τὴν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ μεταγμένην* and not *τὴν ἐμοί μ.* Great emphasis is thus laid on *ἐμοῦ*, and Demosthenes' resentment at Cleon's interference is expressed in the most vigorous language possible.

3. Antiphon *Tet. A.* δ, 1 has *τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τῶν ἐξ ἐμοῦ πραχθέντων*, where Maetznier takes *ἐκ* as for *ὑπό*, as in Ionic usage. But on comparing *Tet. B.* β, 2 and 10, *ἡ ἀλήθεια τῶν πραχθέντων*, this explanation seems open to question. Then again *Ant. 5* § 2 says *δεῖ με σωθῆναι μετὰ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰπόντα τὰ γεγόμενα*, very similar to which is And. *de Myst.* § 55.¹ The expression *τὰ ἐξ ἐμοῦ πραχθέντα* in Antiphon appears to hold a middle position between *ἡ ἀλήθεια τῶν πραχθέντων* (or *γενομένων*)—'the true nature of the facts'—and *ἡ ἀ. τῶν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ π.*: there is not the dynamic force in *ἐξ ἐμοῦ* that there is in *ὑπ' ἐμοῦ*, and *ἐξ ἐμοῦ* is not felt as the agent, but expresses the person concerned in the deeds. It may be some support to this that the defendant has to prove a negative, *i. e.* that he had taken no part at all in the murder. Thus the meaning will be no more than 'the true nature of the facts in which I am concerned,' or 'the true nature of my position.' *Ant. Tet. B.* β, 6 and γ, 10, *φόνος ἐξ ἀμφοῖν γενέσθαι*, where 'both are concerned' in the death of the one, but neither is concerned in at most more than *φόνος ἀκούσιος*, and where *ἐξ ἀμφοῖν* has not the dynamic force of *ὑπ' ἀμφοῖν*, confirms, I think, this view of the passage.

E. C. MARCHANT.

¹ Has attention been drawn to the numerous verbal similarities between *Ant. de caede Her.* and *And. de Myst.*? The external probability that the oligarch Andocides (for such I take him to have been all his life at heart) should admire the oligarch Antiphon, and, being himself in matters oratorical a layman, should use his speeches amongst other materials in preparing his own defence, is fairly supported by internal evidence; for, though there is no similarity in style between the two, there is in phraseology.

NOTES ON GREEK MSS. IN ITALIAN LIBRARIES.

(Continued from page 22.)

BOLOGNA.

For the Libraries at Bologna I may refer to the full account in Blume, *Iter Italicum* ii. pp. 145–163. Two recent publications *Notizie Storiche sulla R. Biblioteca Universitaria di Bologna*, 1872 signed 'Prof. Carlo Gemelli Vice-Bibliotecario,' and *Monografia sull'Archiginnasio di Bologna da Gius. Guidicini* 1870 do not add anything material to our knowledge. The University Library, as is well known, takes its origin from the donation in 1712 of Conte Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli, who died in 1730. See an account of his eventful life in Fantuzzi, *Notizie degli Scrittori Bolognesi*, Bologna 1786 vol. iv. p. 286–326. A catalogue of his collection while still in the owner's hands is given by Talman, *Elenchus librorum orientalium manuscriptorum—a Domino Aloysio Ferdinando Marsigli—collectorum coemptorumque—Viennae Austriae anno MDCCII*. 'Pars 1' in this book contains the Greek MSS., 18 in number, with one printed Greek book. The MSS. may all be identified among those now possessed by the University: to those that enter into my list I have affixed the number of Talman's catalogue. Additions to the Library must have been made at different periods, but mainly by the incorporation in 1867 of the books of the celebrated monastery of San Salvatore. Of this library, extolled by Roccha, Mabillon, Montfaucon, and many other travellers, a short account may be found in Tiraboschi *Storia d. Lett. Ital.* ed. 1791 vii. p. 240, and a fuller in Trombelli, *Memorie storiche concernenti le Due Canoniche di S. Maria et di S. Salvatore insieme unite*, Bologna 1752 pp. 99–105. In several of the MSS. catalogued below will be found references to Pellegrino Fabbri,¹ Prior of the Monastery and virtual founder of the Library.

There are now in use two MS. catalogues, one of the Greek MSS. of the original collection of Marsigli, entitled *Index Mezzofanti*; another, of the MSS. from S. Salvatore, for which there is a separate numeration. In the appendix to the first of the two works cited above, it is stated that the total number of Greek MSS. in the University is 72. This

¹ Or Fabretti, di Baldassare, of Bologna.

is slightly in excess of the number shown to me.²

The Biblioteca Municipale in the beautiful building called the Archiginnasio, once the seat of the University, contains a small collection of twenty-one Greek MSS., which by the courtesy of the librarian were freely given to me for inspection. About the history of this Library I take the following facts from the governmental publication called *Statisticadel Regno d'Italia. Biblioteche. Firenze* 1865' p. xxxiv sq. It consists of the books of several religious bodies already united in the Library of S. Domenico, (earlier details of this *ap.* Blume p. 153 sq.). In 1802 the library was declared Municipal, in 1811 there was added a legacy of books from the Abate Antonio Magnani, which in 1817 were incorporated with the rest of the Library. Magnani's name was to be found on most of the MSS.

The Library in the Collegio di Spagna³, founded in the fourteenth century by Cardinal Albornoz, over which I was shown by the kindness of the Rector, possesses but one Greek MS., numbered 130; it is on paper, of the sixteenth century, and contains some scholia on Callimachus' Hymns, and Theodorus de Mepsibus.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.

Index Mezzofanti.

1. iii. 3559. ANTONII MON. LEXICON GRAECUM. Bomb. 10 x 7, ff. 405, 31 ll., signed quaternions, a. 1291. *Τίτλε, συναγωγή λέξεων συλλεγείσα εκ διαφόρων βιβλίων τῆς παλαιᾶς τε φημι γραφῆς καὶ τῆς νέας καὶ αὐτῆς δῆπου τῆς θύραθεν.* In marg: ἀντωνίου α inc. βαπτος: ὁ ἀπροσπέλαστος παρὰ τὸ ἄ, ἄπτος, καὶ ἄπτος· ὁ οὐκ ἂν τις ἄφαιτο κ.τ.λ.; expl. ὠφωνήκοτες· ὠφωνήσαντες δὲ μικρὸν.
f. 396 r. ἐτελειωθὲ τὸ παρὸν λεξικὸν σὺν θεῷ ἁγίῳ ἐν ἔτει ς-ψ-θ. [xii. Talman.]
2. iv. 3560. ANON. LEXICON GRAEC. Chart. xiv-xv, ff. 237, 9 x 6. Begins and ends with the same words as iii. Damaged at beginning. [iii. Talman.]
3. v. 3561. APHTHONII SOPH. προγυμνάσματα ff. 2-15). HERMOGEN. τέχνη ῥητορ. (18-41). HERMOG. περὶ εὐρσεύων etc. (42-115). THEOPH. CHARACT. (116-

² I have only noted here such as seemed of interest.

³ v. Blume l.c., and an article by Mr. E. Armstrong in *Macmillan's Magazine*, March 1888.

118). DION. HAL. EPIST. *περὶ ὀνομάτων συνθεσέων* (118—124).

Chart. xv.—xvi, 12 × 8, ff. 130. [viii. Talman.]
4. vi. 3562. Ἰωσήφ τοῦ βακενδύτου εἰς τὴν ῥητορικὴν σύνψιν. Chart. xvi. 14 × 10, ff. 58. Printing copy for Robatellus' ed. of 1553. One leaf inserted at beg.; *Donato alla Biblioteca dal Senatore Co. Giovanni Fannizzi* 1761.

5. vii. 3563. PHALARIDIS AL. EPISTOLAE. Chart. xvi. 8 × 5½, ff. 208. Many marg. notes and interlin. glosses in Latin.

At end: παντ' ἔλεγον λαυρέντιος ὁ λεγᾶτος κρεμυνὸς ἐπὶ τῆς βοωνίας ἔτει ἀπὸ τῆς χριστογενείας α χ ξ β (1662).

6. viii. 3564. DEMOSTH. OLYNTH. PHILIPP. ANDR. MEID. ARISTOT. al. with scholia. Bomb. xiv.—xv, ff. 201, defect. at end. [iv. Talman.]

7. ix. 3565. chart. 4½ × 3, ff. 56, 16 ll. Said in catalogue to be written by 'Armando Giovanni le Bouthillier de Rancé,' aged 14, in 1640. There is no subscription, but on f. 1 a coat of arms. The celebrated Trappist lived from 1626—1700.

8. x. 1766. EURIP. HEC., ARIST. PLUTUS. chart. xvi. To the Plutus there is a Latin translation, *Adriano chilio interprete*.

9. xii. 3567. Τρωάς, a poem in barbarous Greek, political verses: inc. *σὺν τοῖς ἑλληνοῖς βασιλεὺς ὡγευκὸς ἀνδρείος*. Chart. xv.—xvi. 8½ × 6½, ff. 236. F. 1. *Iste liber est Monti sti salvatoris bononiæ signatum i inventario sb. No. 21*.

10. xiii. 3568. IOSEPHUS BELL IUD., PHILO DE VIRTUTE LIB. I.

Bomb. xiv.—xv. 11½ × 9, ff. 166. [iv. Talman.]

11. xiv. 3628. ZONARAS EPIST. HIST. Chart. xvi. 10 × 6½, ff. circ. 300. F. 3 the name 'Αδριανού σπαίρα.

At end: O.^u NAB.¹ PFL.¹ et J. c.¹ Bonon. (?)

12. xv. 3629. PLUTARCH LIVES (13). DEM. POL. ANT. PYRRH. ARAT. ARTAX. AGIS CLEOM. TIB. CAL. GRACCH., LYCURG. NUM. LYSANDR. SULL. AGES. POMP. Bomb. xiv. 10 × 7 ff. 266. Well preserved. [i. Talman.]

13. xvi. 3630. PLATO: EUTH. APOL. CRIT. PHAEDR. CRATYL. THEAET. PHAEDR. MENEX. REPUB. (1—5). Bomb. xiii.—xiv. 9½ × 9, ff. 227. A good deal is supplied by later hands. [v. Talman.]

14. xvii. 3631. PHILOSTRAT. IMAGINES. Chart. xv. 8½ × 5½, ff. 80.

At end: *μιχαῆλος ἀποστόλης βυζάντιος βασιλεὺς τῶν τῆδε πενήτων ἐξέγραψε*. Cf. the same expression in a letter of Michael Apostolios' to Bessarion, *Legrand* ii. p. 240 ep. 12. [Talman ii.]

15. xxi. 3635. ALEX. APHR. *ἀπορίαι φυσικαὶ* etc., ARISTOT. *φυσικὰ προβλήματα*, PLUT. DE PLAC. PHILOSOPH., AELIAN *περὶ ζῶων ἰδιότητος*. Chart. xiv. 8½ × 5½, ff. 247. [x. Talman.]

16. xxiii. 3627. VARIA MED. THEOL. LOG. RHET. Bomb. xiv, 11½ × 8, ff. circ. 200. f. 88 a table of ἡλίου κύκλοι, computed for the year ε' ω ξ', indict. 5 i.e. 1352. [i. v. Talman.]

17. xxiv. 2287, 2288. S. BASIL. HOMILIES ON THE PSALMS. In two volumes. membr. xi. ff. 377, 13 × 9½, 29 ll. quaternions signed on first leaf, rulings on the hair side, illuminated. Large and very free minuscule below the line. At end,

*πρῶτῃ πολλὰ καὶ πόνησιν συσχεθέντι
μόλις εὐρομεν τὸ γλυκύτατον τέλος.*

See Montfaucon *Diar. Ital.* p. 408.

F. 1 is the usual inscription of the Monastery of S. Salvatore.

18. xxv. 3638. EVANGELISTARION. membr. xii. 13½ × 10, ff. 235, double cols., quaternions. Upright minuscule below the line.

At end, in contemporary hand: τοῦ ταπεινοῦ καὶ

ἁμαρτωλοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ οὐγγροβλαχίας (i. Hungro-Walachiae, as Talman suggests). [xviii. Talman.]

19. xxvii. 3640. ESDRAS AND ECCLESIASTES (part) Membr. xi. 11½ × 8½, ff. 12, being 1 gathering. Double cols., 35ll.

20. xxix. 3642. THEOPHANES ON THE DECALOGUE; in vulgar Greek.

Chart. 6 × 4, ff. 104 a. 1598.

At end: *ἔτους ζ ρ ε' ἐν μηνὶ ἰαννου | αρίον κ' ἡμέρα*

κ
x
α
λλ ρ' (! Κύριλλος μοναχός)

Cf. another Cyrillus, possessor of MS. 35.

21. xxxi. 3643. EUSEB. PRAEPAR. EVANG. Bomb. xiii. 13 × 9½, ff. circ. 300, beg. restored by a late hand.

At end:—

*εὐαγγελικῆς ὡδὶ σὺν θῷ τέλος
μνήμησιν τοῖνυν τῶν χειρῶν ὅστις φέρεται
βακενδυτῶντος γραφείως κληφόρου
ἐξαπτεργῶν ἐκ γένους κατηγμένον
σώσαι θεὸς λέγων περ αὐτὸν ἐν κρίσει.*

[xiv. Talman.]

22. xxxii. 3644. EUSEBIUS DEMONSTR. EVANGELICA. Bomb. xiii. 13 × 9½, ff. 172. Text very abbreviated. Not in the same hand as xxxi. [xiv. Talman.]

23. xxxiii. 3645. MS. CATALOGUE OF THE VATICAN LIBRARY. chart. 9 × 7, xvi. ff. 123 inc. ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τραπέζῃ πίναξ σὺν θεῷ πάντων τῶν βιβλίων τῆς βιβλιοθήκης. Διδύμου σχόλια εἰς τὴν ὁμήρου ἱλιάδα. Ὁμήρου ἱλιάς μετὰ τῆς ἐξηγητικῆς: ex pl. τοῦ αὐτοῦ [χρυσοστόμου] λόγος εἰς τὴν ὑκαπαντὴν τοῦ κῶ καὶ θῷ καὶ σπρ ἡμῶν ἢ χσ. δόξα τῷ μόνῳ θῷ. χρίστε διδοῦ πονέοντι τέην πολύβολον ἀργῆν.

SAN SALVATORE.

24. 2271 (110) AESCHYLUS TRAG. SEPTEM. Chart. xiv. 13 × 9, ff. 72 with many blank leaves, 44 ll. Well written and preserved: with scholia.

At end of 'Ικετίδες. τέλος δεδωκὸς χριστὲ σοὶ χάριν φέρω, inside the cover: *Ginnasi*: did the book once belong to the Archiginnasio? At beg.: the usual formula, *Iste liber est Monti sti salvatoris bononiæ signatum T inventario sb numero 92*.

25. 2280. (305) Chart. 13 × 9, ff. 319, quinions: a. 1528, 1529.

1—168 PTOL. DE GEOGR.: f. 1617v. ἐκ τῶν κλαυδίου πτολεμαίου γεωγραφικῶν βιβλίων ὅκτω τὴν οἰκουμένην πᾶσαν, οὐαλεριανὸς φορολιονεὺς φιλέλλην κελεύοντος τοῦ σεβαστοῦ καὶ ἀγίου καὶ φιλολόγου πατρὸς περιγρίνου βοωνιεύς, τοῦ τότε τῆς ἡμετέρας πολιτείας ἄρχοντος καὶ εὐδαιμόνως τοιμαίνοντος, ὑπετίπισα, ἐν μοναστήριῳ τοῦ ἀγίου ἀντανίου ἐνετίησιν· χιλιοστῷ πεντακοσιοστῷ εἰκοστῷ ὀγδόῳ ἔτει ἀπὸ τῆς θεογονίας δεκάτῃ τοῦ ἑκατομβαιῶνος: the same is repeated on f. 168 but with ἀπριλλίου for ἑκατομβαιῶνος.

169—252 ANON. COMMENT. εἰς τὴν τετράβιβλον πτολεμαίου.

ff. 252v, 253r: ταύτην βίβλον μετέγραψεν ὁ οὐαλεριανὸς φορολιβιεύς ὁ ἀλβίνου κανονικὸς τῆς πολιτείας ἐπνομασμένος τοῦ ἀγίου σωτήρος ἡ τότε ἡκμαίεν κατὰ πᾶσαν ἰταλίαν, πλήρης ἀγαθῶν τε καὶ σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν, ὃν χρόνον πᾶσα ἰδέα τῶν κακῶν τοὺς ἄνους κατεῖχον, λοιμὸς τε καὶ λιμὸς, ἑκατέρω φοβερά. ἔπερ ἐκ τοῦ ὧμοῦ πολέμου τοῦ προγεγεννημένου καθίσταντο. ἦν δὲ καὶ ὁ πόλεμος ἀκμάζων καὶ τῶν ἰταλῶν πάντων δὲ ὡς εἰπεῖν χριστιανῶν πολεμουμένων εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἀπλῶς δὲ εἰπὼν πάσης ἰταλίας στασιαζούσης. ἤμελλεν δὲ ἐλευθεσθαι αὐτὸς ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ ἐκ τῆς ἰσπανίας εἰς τὴν ἰταλίαν. διὸ καὶ ἐνετίησιν μέγα ναυτικὸν παρεσκευάζετο καὶ πάντα χεῖρῳ τῶν προγεγεννημένων τὰ

μέλλοντα ἐνομιζοντο, ἔτει ἀπὸ θεογονίας χιλιοστῶ πεντακοσιοστῶ τε καὶ εἰκοστῶ ἐντὶ μνηδὸς Ἀπριλλίου τετάρτῃ ἱσταμένου. ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου καταβολῆς κατὰ τὴν ἑβραϊκὴν ἀλήθειαν ἔτει πεντάκις χιλιοστῶ διακοσιοστῶ οὐδοηκοστῶ ὀγδόῃ. (He meant of course ἐξέκκις χιλ.)

254—303 CLAUD. PTOL. DE HARMONIS: in another hand (Fulgentius) unsigned.

305—319 PORPHYR. εἰσαγωγ. εἰς τὴν ἀποτελεσματικὴν τοῦ Πτολεμαίου in Valerianus' hand: shorter signature.

Valeriano Albini of Forlì, Canon of S. Salvatore, was a prolific scribe about the years 1525—45; he was later Librarian of the Monastery of S. Antonio di Castello in Venice, where he may perhaps have succeeded Agostino Steuco. Cf. M. Henri Omont, *La Bibliothèque de Guillaume Pelicier*, Bibl. de l'Ecole de Chartes p. 45 sq., and a specimen of Valeriano's hand in his 'Facsimiles.' From the lengthy subscriptions in the Bolognese MSS. several facts may be gathered about Valeriano's life, particularly his employment of a subordinate copyist, acknowledged in MS. 37. Cf. also *Bibliot. Angelica*, MS. 11.

26. 2302 (216) ARIST. DE PART. ANIM., al. phys. Chart. xv.—xvi. 13 x 9, ff. 124, quinions.

f. 124r. ζαχαρίας δὲ καλλιέργης καὶ κρῆς τὸ ἔθνος εἰς πατάβιον ἐξέγραψα. Legrand i. p. cxxx.

27. 2304 (586) membr. 12 x 9, ff. 259 quinions, a. 1532, 1533.

1—239 EUSEBIUS DEMONSTR. EVANG. f. 239r. ταύτην τὴν βίβλον οὐαλεριάνος δὲ ἀλβίνου φορολαβιεύς τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου σωτήρος προσαγορευομένης πολιτείας κανονικὸς ἐν τῇ τῆς ἁγίας μαγδαληνῆς μοναστηρίου τῇ πτολιθεῖρου μινανδουλῇ καλουμένῃ, ἐκ τῆς τοῦ σοφωτάτου ἀρχοντος ἰωάννου φραγκίσκου πίκου βιβλιοθήκης ἀνέγραψεν. ἔτει ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ κῦ ἡμῶν ἰου χρυσ. σαρκώσεως χιλ. πεντακοσιοστῶ τριακοστῶ δευτέρῃ πρώτῃ ἱσταμένη ποσειδῶνος.

f. 1—20 (new paging) TATIAN CONTRA GENTES: with a shorter subscription, α φ λ γ, January 13.

Only the beginning of the book is in Valerianus' hand; the rest, and both subscriptions are by Fulgentius. On Giovanfrancesco Pico see the article in *Traboschi Biblioteca Modenese*, vol. iv. One of his MSS. is at Modena, No. 247.¹

28. 2305 (222) ALEX. APHR. IN AR. DE SENSU, al. Chart. xvi. 12½ x 9, ff. 163. Unsigned but probably by Zach. Callierges.

29. 2373 (582) THEODORETUS ON EZECHIEL, DANIEL etc.

membr. xi. 11½ x 8, ff. 335, 34 ll. Beautiful small running minuscule below the line: at end, τέλος δεδωκώς εὐχαριστῶ κυρίῳ.

30. 2603 (641) PROPHET. MINORES.

membr. 9½ x 7, ff. 300, signed quaternions, ruled on hair side, 30 lines. Upright, rather flat minuscule below the line; a. 1046. f. 300r. ἐτελειώθη ἡ δέλτος

αὕτη μνηρ μαρτίῳ Γ ὥρα β ἡμ β ἐπὶ βασιλείας κων σταντίνου μονομάχου καὶ ζωῆς τῆς πορφυρογεννήτου

καὶ πριαρ μιχαήλ· γραφήσα διὰ χειρὸς σάβα α καὶ πρ οἱ ἀναγινώσκοντες ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ διὰ τὸν ν κν εἶους ς φ ν δ ἰν ἰδ. Cf. Montfaucon, D. I. p. 407.

¹ Another is in the Bodleian, Canon. gr. 34; cf. the subscription f. 131, Μιχαήλ δαμασκηνὸς δὲ κρῆς καὶ τὰ παρόντα τῶν ἁγίων τεσσάρων εὐαγγελιστῶν ἁγία εὐαγγέλια τῇ ἐκλαμπροτάτῃ καὶ σοφωτάτῃ ἰωάννῃ φραγκίσκῳ πίκῳ μινανδουλῆς ἀρχοντος ἐξέγραψεν ἐν ἔτει α φ ι ε μνηρ μαλω κγ [1515], and the remarkable Latin note on f. 319, printed in the Catalogue.

31. 2612 (109) ORPHEI ARGONAUT. (1—37), EURIP. HECUBA. (38—74).

Chart. vx. 9 x 9 ff. 75. The Orpheus is in the hand of G. Valla, though unsigned.

32. 2639 (1) MAN. MOSCHOPOLUS, EROTEMATA. chart. xv. 8½ x 5½, ff. 106. At end: *Iste liber est sebastiani boche et amicorum*. Perhaps one of the family of Bocchi, of whom notices are given in Fantuzzi, *Notizie degli Scrittori Bolognesi*, t. ii. p. 217sq.

33. 2702 (579) VARIA ECCLES. chart. 8½ x 6, ff. 230. F. 8r. φύλαττε κε τῶν δούλων σου νικολαον ἡμα ἁμῶν, in the hand of the text.

F. 128r. is a calendar calculated for the years 575-9 and 5, i.e. 1491 and 1492.

34. 2775 (640) NOVUM TESTAMENTUM. Membr. xii. ff. 443 8 x 5, 25 ll.

35. 2881 (2) MOSCHOPOL. ἐρωτήματα. Chart. xv.—xvi. 6 x 4, ff. 136. At end: ἡ βίβλος αὐτῇ πέλει κυρίῳ τῷ ἱερομοναχῷ.

36. 2292 (224) EUCLID. Chart. xvi. 13 x 9, ff. 246. unsigned, but ff. 1-21 are in Valerianus' hand, ff. 22-end in Fulgentius'.

36. 2293 (223) PROCLUS IN EUCL., THEON SMYRN. Chart. xvi. 13 x 9, ff. 185 a. 1529. ff. 1-160, Proclus, in Fulgentius' hand; ff. 162-184 Theon, in Valerianus'.

F. 185 (in Valerianus' hand) the subscription: *φουλγέντιος φορολαβιεύς δὲ Γουλιηλμου προγεννώλεως [!] ταύτην βίβλον μετέγραψεν ἐνετίησι εν κοινοβίῳ τοῦ ἁγίου ἀντωνίου ἀπὸ τῆς Θεογονίας ἐναντῶ χιλιοστῶ πεντακοσιοστῶ τε καὶ εἰκοστῶ ἐντὶ σκιροφοριῶνος τρίτῃ ἱσταμένην κελύσαντος περεγρίνου βονανίους τοῦ τότε πάσης τῆς ἡμετέρας πολιτείας κράτος ἔχοντος, ὃ καὶ πάντες πάντα εὐχονταί ἀγαθῶ. ὧν γὰρ πατὴρ ἀγαθὸς τε καὶ σπουδαῖος καὶ φιλολόγος πολλοὺς ἀλώμασι ταύτην βιβλιοθήκην ἐπήγειρε· ἐν δὲ τῇ αὐτῇ χρόνῳ ἐγὼ τε καὶ ἄλλοι παμπληθεῖς φιλομαθεῖς ἐσπουδάσαμεν τοῖς λόγοις ἑλληνικοῖς τε καὶ βωμαιοῖς ἐπὶ αὐγουστίνῳ εὐγουβίῳ διδασκάλῳ ἀνδρὸς σοφωτάτου τε καὶ πανν εἰσεβούς.*

From this subscription we get the name of the second hand that so often appears with Valeriano's. It is easy to conjecture that Fulgentius, a native of the same town (Forlì) as Valeriano, may have been a dependant of the Canon of S. Salvatore. On Agostino Steuco of Gubbio, at this time Librarian of S. Antonio in Castello, see *Traboschi, Stor. d. Lett. Ital.* ed. 1791 vii. p. 396: he became Librarian of the Vatican in 1538.

38. 2294 (221) Chart. 13 x 9, ff. 176

ff. 1-59 DEXIPPUS ON THE CATEGORIES.

59r. Valeriano's signature, October 1530.

ff. 61-148 ALEX. APHR. φυσικά:

148: Valeriano's signature, ἐν τῇ μοναστηρίῳ τοῦ ἁγ. σωτήρος, τὸν ἐν τῇ βονονία πόλει, March 1. 1531.

ff. 149-176 ALEX. APHR. πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοκράτορας περὶ εἰραμνῆς καὶ τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν. Unsigned; by Fulgentius.

39. 2432 (217) ALCINOUS, εἰσαγωγὴ τῶν δογμάτων πλάτωνος, ARISTOX. HARMON. al. mus. Chart. xv. 11 x 8½, in various hands.

40. 2647 (131) APHTHONIUS, προγυμνάσματα. Chart. xv.—xvi. 8½ x 6, ff. 58.

41. 2359 (218) SIMPLICIUS ON EPICETUS. Chart. 12 x 8½, ff. 119, a. 1490. f. 119r. + ἀντάνιος μεδιολανεύς καὶ ταύτην τὴν βύβλον ἐν κρήτῃ ἐξέγραψα χάριν τοῦ πάσαις ἀρεταῖς κεκοσμημένου ἐγγενέως ἀρχοντος κυροῦ γεωργίου δαμουλίνου, οφείλων αὐτῷ οὐ μόνον τὴν μεταγραφὴν ταύτης τῆς βύβλου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν ἀξιολόγων βυβάων; τῶν πολλῶν καὶ καλῶν προμπαρξασῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ χαρίτων ἐμοί: ἐτελειώθη δὲ [marg.] κατὰ τὴν κγ τοῦ φενουαρίου αὐς ἀπὸ τῆς κυριακῆς ἐναντήσεως. Montfaucon l.c. p. 408.

42. 2372 (581) S. GREGORIUS, DIALOGI. Bomb. 12 x 8½, ff. 187, double cols., a. 1312. Greek, with

Latin transl. in second column, extending however only to f. 58r.

At end:—

ὅσπερ ἔνοιαι χαίρουσιν εἶδεν πρὶθα
καὶ οἱ κυνδυνεύοντες εὐρεῖν λυμένα
εὐτας καὶ οἱ γράφοντες εὐρεῖν βιβλίον τέλος. ἡ
γράφη—ὡς παρὸν βιβλίον διὰ χειρὸς καμὸν τοῦ ἁμαρτο-
λοῦ λέωντος ἀναγνώστου τοῦ εὐγενεῖαν ἔν μνη-
ιοῦλλιν ἰδὲ Ν. ἱ. ἔτους 700 καὶ ὅσοι ἀνὰ χειρὸς
λάβεται αὐτὸ εὐχέσθ[η] τὸ γράψαντι ὅτι χωρηκὸς
ἦμιν τῆς τέχνης ταύτης. ἔγραψεν δὲ δι' ἐξεδρωμῆς
καὶ ἐξώδου τοῦ παυρὸς εὐγενεστάτου ἀρχόντος καὶ
γραμματικοῦ τοῦ παλαιῶν κρητῆς κυρίου
ἀγγέλου: καριώλα [sic].

43. 2498 (5) LEXICON GRAEC. LATIN. Membr. xvi. 10½ × 7, ff. 342. *title*, 'Alphabetarium utriusque linguae.'

At end: Rdu Pr. Fr. Peregrinus emit hunc librum Ven. M.D xxxiii. xi. Januarii.

44. 2434 (584) CHRYSOST. HOMIL. Membr. xi. 10 × 8, ff. 189, quaternions signed. Good upright minuscule, below the line.

45. 2700 (108) VARIA GRAMMATICA, AESCH. SEPTIM. C. THEB., SOPHOCLES ELECTRA. chart. xvi. ff. 237.

46. 2911 (172) EXTRACTS FROM VARIOUS AUTHORS, with Index: chart. xv. 5½ × 4, ff. 138.

At end: ὁ κύριος φράγκικος ἀκκίδας τοῦ μονοῦλ

χωρεπισκόπου βοδίου υἱὸς πρωτονοτάριος καὶ πρωτοπασ-
καθολικὸς μεσσηνίης τῆς σικελίας ἐκ πολλῆς εἰς τὴν
ἀποστολικὴν καθέδραν προθυμίας, τοῦτο τὸ βιβλίον
πολλῶ πόνῳ καὶ δαπάνῃ συνάξας ἐκ τῶν ἀνατολικῶν
προσέφερε τῷ μαρκεσίτῳ πάπα σέξτω πέμπτῳ ἀρχιερεῖ
νεώστῳ ἐν τῇ βατικάνῃ βιβλιοθήκῃ φυλαχθῆσόμενον
ἔτει 1585.

At beg: βιβλίον ἐν ᾧ περιέχονται ποικίλαι ἐκλογαὶ
ἐκ διαφόρων γνῶμων οὐκ ὀλίγων θεολόγων καὶ
φιλοσόφων, κομισθὲν ἐν τῇ περιωνύμῳ ἰταλίᾳ ἐξ ἑώας
παρὰ τοῦ κυροῦ φραγκισκου ἀκκίδας πρωτοπασπᾶ μεσσηνίης,
υἱοῦ τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς ἐν ἱερειῶσι κυροῦ ἐμμανουὴλ χορο-
επισκόπου νήσω σικελίας, ἐνδὸς τῶν εὐγενῶν τῆς
κολαστικῆς νήσου καὶ πόλεως, ὅπερ τῇ σῇ ἐκλαμπρότητι
δουλικῶς προσάγει, ἵκετεύων σὲ ἀσμένως καὶ φιλανθρώ-
πως δεῖσθαι τοῦτο: τόνγε ἡγεῖσθαι ὡς ἓνα τῶν
ἐλαχίστων δούλων τῶν παρὰ σοὶ ἐπικεικότες.

ARCHIGINNASIO.

1. A. 1. 1. CHRYSOSTOM HOMIL. ON MATTHEW. Membr. xi. 12 × 9½, ff. circ. 200, double cols., upright minuscule below the line.

2. A. 1. 2. CATENA PATRUM ON JOB. Membr. 13 × 8½, ff. circ. 100, signed quaternions, saec. xii. On last page: τοῦ λουκά τοῦ βομφίου καὶ τῶν φίλων.

3. A. 1. 3. CATENA ON MATTHEW. Bomb. xiv. 13½ × 9½, ff. 190, 50 ll.

4. A. 1. 9. ANON. HOMIL. IN EVANG. chart. xvi. ff. circ. 100: unsigned, but in the hand of Andreas Darnarius.

5. A. 1. 13. EUTHYMIUS DE SYNODIS. al. eccles. xvi. 13 × 9: partly written by A. Darnarius. Unsigned.

6. A. 1. 14. PROCLUS IN PLAT. ALCIPIADEM. chart., xvi. 13 × 9, ff. 128: defect. at end.

7. A. 1. 16. DAVID IN PORPHYR. QUINQUE

¹ Apparently the same as the owner of Canon. gr. 86, where the subscription is τοῦ λουκά τοῦ βομφίου καὶ τῶν φίλων τῶν σπουδαίων, the *Catalogus Bibliothecae Bonifolidae quae perstat Bononiæ: Faventiae* s.a. (but before 1734) contains printed books only.

VOCAB., ET IN ARIST. CATEG. chart. xvi. 13 × 9, ff. circ. 300: unsigned, but written by Darnarius.

8. A. 1. 16. CHRYSOST. HOM. IN GENESIN. Membr. 11½ × 8, ff. 303, 33 ll., quaternions, saec. x.; in two hands, both large upright minuscule upon the line.

9. A. 1. 17. GREG. NAZIANZ. HOMILIAE. Membr. x-xi. 9½ × 7½, double cols., ff. 207, 25 ll. Upright minuscule, below the line but often cut by it.

10. A. 1. 18, 19. EUCLID. Membr. xi. 9½ × 7½, ff. 336, 29 ll., quaternions: medium-sized upright minuscule, below the line, beautifully written, a good deal ligatured: many technical compendia, few scholia in the hand of the text. Defect. at end. Cf. Heiberg, *Euclid*, ed. 1883, praef. p. ix.

11. A. 1. 20. SOPHOCLES ALIAX, ELECTRA: with Latin interlin. glosses. chart. xv-xvi. 9 × 6½, ff. circ. 100.

At beg: *M. Andr.*.....(?) *Castell.*, with a shield.

12. A. 1. 21. VARIA STRATEGICA, ARRIAN. AELIAN. POLYAEN. chart. xvi. 8½ × 6, ff. circ. 100.

13. A. 1. 23. DION. PERIEGET. COSMOGRAPHIA: with scholia. Chart. xv. ff. 88.

GENOA.

The only collection of Greek manuscripts in Genoa worthy of the name is that now possessed by the *Missione urbana di san Carlo*, Piazza S. Maria Angelorum. A catalogue of these MSS. with some history of the Library will be found in *Banchero, Genova e le Duse Riviere*, Genova 1846, pp. 497-523; the portion of the book relating to libraries was contributed by Grassi. *Banchero's* book, though quoted by recent travellers to Genoa (e.g. *Neugebauer, Serapeum*, 1857, p. 138 sq.; *Molard, Archives des Missions Scientifiques*, 3^e sér. v. p. 137 sq.), does not appear very widely known; only one date for instance of those in Grassi's catalogue appears in *Gardthausen's* list, and that from Stein's preface to *Herodotus* 1869 praef. p. vii. It may be useful therefore to give here some details of palaeographical interest, some already to be found in Grassi, while others are due to my own observation. The collection of thirty-nine Greek MSS. is what survives of a legacy of 300 MSS. given to the *Ospedale degli Incurabili* in 1528 by Filippo Saoli, Bishop of Brugnato, and bought in 1746 by the *Missione Urbana*. A life of Filippo Saoli (1491-1531) is given in *Oldoinus' 'Athenaeum ligusticum'*, *Perusia* 1680, with copious references to earlier authorities.

MS. 2 (31. 6. 1.) of the year 1075 is already known through Stein *l.c.*

MS. 7 (31. 6. 5.) Chrysostom's Homilies on Matthew, membr. 12½ × 9½ in., ff. 314, double cols., quaternions numbered front and back, 31 lines to the page, a. 1057: + 314v. τέλος τῶν βιβλίων ἐν χαίῃ

τῷ καὶ ἡμῶν τοῦ Ϟ | ἐκ τῆς ἐρμηνείας τοῦ κατὰ ματ

εὐαγγελίου | ἔτους ς' φξε ἀναγινώσκων εὐχεσθε ὑπερ |
ἐμοῦ τοῦ ταπεινοῦ διὰ τὸν κν | ἀμήν.

MS. 8 (31. 6. 6) CHRYSOSTOM ON GENESIS, saec. xi.,
has at the end in a late hand,

Α Β
εκ τοῦ ψυφοῦς τοῦ ἐχῆ μ
πη πε τ ρ α σ κ α : θ (1)

MS. 11 (31. 6. 9) CHRYSOSTOM HOMILIES, 13 × 10
in., ff. 369 saec. x., illuminated: f. 2 vers. before
the text. in thin uncial,

δ τῆς μονῆς πρόεδρος ἰωσήφ λόγων
ὡς ὡν ἐρασθῆς τῶν σοφῶν ἰωάννου
ἐξωραΐζων τὴν προσφέρει βίβλον
τῶ τῶν ἄλλων ταγμάτων πρωτοστάτη

MS. 13 (31. 6. 11) CHRYSOSTOM HOMILIES: saec.
xi., ff. 297: on f. 4 is the following librarian's index
in a late hand; λόγοι το χρισστομ διάφοροι βεβραῖνον¹
λόγοι λ. This hand recurs in MS. 14, ἐξαίμερον τοῦ
χρισστομ βεβραῖνον, MS. 19 ὁμιλίας τοῦ μεγάλου
βασιλείου εἰς τὸν προφήτην ἡσαῖαν βεβραῖνον, MS. 29
(Ioann. Climaci Scala Paradisi) but erased.

MS. 14 (31. 6. 12) CHRYSOST. HOMIL. saec. xi. ff.
303. On f. 185v., nearly illegible, κῆ βοήθει τῶ σῶ
δοῦλῳ ἀναγνώστῃ.....καὶ κληρικὸν τῆς ἁγίας σωφίας Ν ς

ἔτους ς' ψ ξ θ μερ ζ' πρω της χυ γενίσεως ωρα ως ενα [a.
1261].

MS. 17 (31. 6. 15) S. BASIL. HOMILIES etc:
11½ × 9 in., ff. 305, saec. x, finely written and illu-
minated. At the end, in large red uncial, ἡ διαρου-
μενη ἀδιαρέτως καὶ συναπτομένη διαρετῶς παναγία τριάς
ὁ θς τὸν δοῦλον σου ἰωσήφ τὸν τοῦτο κτησάμενον
πρεσβείαις τῶν ἱεραρχῶν βασιλείου καὶ γρηγορίου διὰ
παντὸς τείχεζε πανοικίας δόσει· ἀμήν.

MS. 30 (31. 4. 4) Simonis mon. Sermones, ff. 320,
saec. xii-xiii; f. 319v. παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς ὅσοι ἀναγινώσκετε
τὴν παρούσαν μελίσρυντον θειοτάτην καὶ ψυχωφελῆ
βίβλον εὐχεσθαι καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ γράψαντος εὐτελοῦς
μοναχοῦ καὶ ἱεροδιακόνου γερασίου ἀμαρτωλοῦ τοῦ καὶ
ἀρχιμανδρίτου χρηματίσαντος ἐν τῇ νεία μονῇ ἐν τῇ νήσω
χίω, ὅπως εὐροίμι ἔλεος ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως. ἀξιῶσέτε δὲ
καὶ ὑμᾶς τοῦτε ἐντυγχάνοντας καὶ μετὰ πόθου θεοῦ καὶ
ἀγάπης ἐμπύρου ταύτην ἀναγινώσκοντας αὐτὸς ὁ
ποιητὴς καὶ δημιουργὸς τῶν ἀπάντων χριστὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ
υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ υἱὸς τῆς πανμνήτου καὶ πανπεράγνου
παννπερουλογημένης παννπερὸδξου παναγίας ἁγίου καὶ
παναχράντου μαρίας, τῶν αἰώνιων ἀγαθῶν ἐπιτυχεῖν ἐν
τῇ φοβερῇ καὶ ἀθανάτῳ καὶ ἀπέραντῳ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ·
ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν ταύτην κεκτημένον—φιλόθεον καὶ
φιλόχριστον—καὶ ἐμὸν κατὰ πᾶν προσφιλέστατον
γλυκύτατον υἱὸν κατὰ [Γ]—σρίας ψυχῆς καὶ
ἀμαρτιῶν ἀφέσεως.

MS. 32. (31. 4. 6) CANONES ECCLESIAE, chart. ff.
309, n. 1322: f. 241v. ἐγρά δὲ ἐπὶ ἔτους ς' ω λ, ἐν
μηνί ὀκτωβρίῳ θ κν Κ [ζ] Ν ε.

¹ Similar Greek forms for 'membranaceous' are
βεμβράνης Vitt. Eman. (Rome) MS. graec. 10 (a.
1641), βεμβρινον Bodl. Barocc. 230, and, no doubt,
the strange developments δρ and δέυρανός, δέυρανον
in Vat. gr. 1414 ap. Nollac, *Mélanges d'Archeologie
et d'Histoire*, 1886 p. 253 sq. The δ indeed is inexplic-
able, but for the εὐ cf. νοεμβριω = Novembri, etc.

MS. 40 (41. 4. 7) SIMPLICIUS ON ARISTOTLE'S
CATEGORIES, chart. 9 × 6½, ff. 160, 38 lines saec. xiv-
xv, well written. Grassi was unable to identify the
author, whose name is wanting. This is the only
non-ecclesiastical MS. in the collection.

INDEX (BOLOGNA AND GENOA).

'A.' signifies 'Archiginnasio,' 'Gen.' the
Missioni urbana at Genoa; the other numbers refer
to the University Library at Bologna.

DATED MANUSCRIPTS.

a. 1046, 30.
1057, Gen. 7.
1075, Gen. 2.
1312, 42.
1322, Gen. 32.
1352, circ., 16.
1490, 41.
1491, circ., 33.
1528, 25.
1529, 25, 37.
1530, 38.
1531, 38.
1532, 27.
1533, 27.
1553, 4.
1598, 20.
1640, 3365.

SCRIBES.

Andreas Darmarius A. 9, 13, 15.
Antonius Damilas 41.
Cyrillus mon. 20.
Fulgenzio Guglielmi of Forlì 25, 27, 36, 37, 38.
Georgius Valla 31.
Gerasimus of Chios, Gen. 30.
Leon Eugenianus lector 42.
Michael Apostolios 14.
Nicephorus (ἐξαπτερύγων ἐκ γένους κατηγμένος) 21.
Nicolaus 33.
de Rancé, Armand Jean le Bouthillier 7.
Sabas mon. 30.
Theodorus, Gen. 2.
Valeriano Albini 25, 27, 36, 37, 38
Zacharius Callierges 26 (28).

POSSESSORS, ETC.

Accidas, Franciscus and Manuel 46.
'Αδριανός 11.
Anthimus of Hungro-Walachia 18.
Bochee (?) Sebastianus 32.
Bomphius, Lucas A. 2.
Cariola (?), Palladius Angelus 42.
Castell. (?) M. Andr. A. 20.
Chilius, Adrianus 8.
Cyrillus hieromon. 35.
Damoulinos, Georgius 41.
Fannizzi, Giovanni 4.
Josephus, Gen. 11 and 17.
Laurentius of Cremona 5.
Peregrinus, prior of S. Salvatore 25, 37, 43.
Pico, Giovanfrancesco, della Mirandola 27.
Steuco, Agostino, of Gubbio 37.

T. W. ALLEN.

BLAYDES'S *RANAE*.

Aristophanis Ranae. Annotatione critica, commentario exegetico, et scholiis Graecis instructis FREDERICUS H. M. BLAYDES, LL.D., &c. Halis Saxonum, in Orphanotrophei Libraria. MDCCCLXXXIX. 10 mks.

ALL scholars, English and foreign, will gladly give a respectful welcome to this eighth instalment from the veteran editor of *Aristophanes*. The character of Dr. Blaydes's work is by this time so well known to those concerned as to make any general estimate superfluous. Whatever may be the difference of opinion upon this or that point, those who will candidly accept from the editor the help he offers, and not require of him that which is not in his plan, cannot but be benefited by his fulness of material, his fertility in suggestion, his vivacious and unflagging interest in the subject. In the present volume there is no falling off: always rich, if sometimes too much *amator ingenii sui*, he here maintains his abundance and tightens his control. If I fill this article, as it is my business to do, with matters of dispute, it will not be for want of gratitude to Dr. Blaydes for the pleasure and instruction which he has given. Commendation or introduction he does not need, and I will rather take the opportunity of his publication to investigate some of the points in the *Ranae* upon which he leaves or makes room for improvement.

There is one defect, or at least one danger, which a commentator upon Aristophanes can hardly escape, for it lies in the very nature of his subject. He will certainly contract and even cultivate a habit of indecision. Aristophanes is full of expressions only to be explained, at best, provisionally. Instead of the minute knowledge of place, time, and circumstance, upon which the satirist presumed, we have little or nothing but rival guesses, ancient and modern, differing in ingenuity but carrying for the most part no authority at all. Among the ancient suggestions it is often impossible to decide which, if any, is something more than a guess; among the modern, in a case of difficulty, it rarely happens that one only is specious. A complete commentary must therefore often cite on the same point several opinions, none certainly right but none quite out of court. In short, a careful edition of Aristophanes will always have a large ingredient of 'variorum'; and the mind of an editor long occupied with Aristo-

phanes, 'like the dyer's hand, subdued to what it works in', is likely to be coloured, perhaps over-coloured, with the 'variorum' complexion.

To this tendency Dr. Blaydes, by his very care and scrupulousness, is not unfavourable: and accustomed to the task of recording alternatives he sometimes leaves us without an opinion where in him it would have been no presumption to pronounce one.

Take, for example, the familiar passage in the hymn of the mystae to Iacchus (v. 402):

Ἰακχε, φιλοχόρεντα, συμπρόπεμπε με.
σὺ γὰρ κατασχίσας ἐπὶ τε γέλωτι
καὶ εὐτελείᾳ τὸν τε σανδαλίσκον
καὶ τὸ μακίον ἐξέυρες ὥστ'
ἄζημίους παίζειν τε καὶ χορεύειν.¹

To the Athenian audience this was no doubt perfectly clear, and it seems at first sight plain enough, in its general meaning, to us. The myst thanks the god for having given religious sanction to a practice so convenient as that of wearing torn clothes in the procession to Eleusis. So far the recent editors (Mitchell, Kock, Merry) all agree. But the scholium strangely takes a different course, and tells us that the poet's object was to satirize the parsimony of the choregus, who had provided the performers with shabby costume. Thus explained, the words would have nothing to do with religion at all, and their interest would be of a quite different kind. It is therefore the first question, whether the scholium, in consideration of its antiquity, is entitled to any attention: and it is here that we look for the editor's decision, but do not get it. The passage is elaborately annotated, and in the first five notes the scholium, though cited, seems to be overruled. But at the end we read: 'ἄζημίους, i.e. ἀδαπάνους... nisi passivo potius sensu vox accipienda est, impune, sine damno, sine detrimento. Ita choregorum parsimonia perstringi videbitur, qui etc.' By this indirect way of reserving judgment the reader is apt to be altogether confused; and it is the less desirable, because here, as often in similar cases, the editor's criticism upon the current view well deserves to be put more decisively. In rejecting the scholium altogether, the recent commentaries are justified. It is a foolish guess, which ignores the conditions of the problem. But the recent commentaries also omit something, and what they omit is

¹ I give Mr. Blaydes's readings. The variants do not affect the sense.

indicated by Dr. Blaydes, when he hesitates over the rendering of ἀζημίους. Indirectly this may mean *with cheapness* (Merry), but the primary meaning is that given by Dr. Blaydes, *impune, sine damno, without damage*: which may help us to answer the most interesting question of all—Why was it (as Aristophanes implies) a matter of religious precept to dress in torn clothes for the Eleusinia? Aristophanes, I think, knew and shows us why. It was one of the innumerable devices of superstition against *invidia* or the evil eye. The greater the happiness the more the danger: therefore in the supreme felicity of the initiated most danger of all. Therefore, by the benevolent direction of the god himself, they disguised their happiness in the garb of beggars, 'so as to take no damage in the joyous feast.' The motive of the mystae in wearing torn shoes was the same as Agamemnon's, when in the play, before walking over the purple, he takes off his shoes altogether. The supposed tenderness of Iacchus towards poor men's purses is merely the comedian's jest, for which he avails himself of the conveniently ambiguous ἀζήμιος.

A much better way of dealing with a difficulty is the editor's at *v.* 190. Says Charon:

δοῦλον οὐκ ἄγω,
εἰ μὴ νευανμάχηκε τὴν περὶ τῶν κρεῶν.

'I convey no slave, unless he fought (and so became entitled to his liberty) at'—the battle of Arginusae. Why was this battle called ἡ περὶ τῶν κρεῶν? All agree that the phrase was suggested, as to the mere form of it, by the proverb, ὁ λαγὺς τρέχει τὸν περὶ τῶν κρεῶν (*δρόμον*) a race for its meat or, more elegantly, for its life. But this does not take us very far. Why should the proverb, or, to be more exact, a phrase somewhat like the proverb, have been tacked to this particular battle? Many answers are given. Dr. Blaydes decides definitely for one of the miscellaneous views in the scholium, that the battle was περὶ τῶν κρεῶν because upon it was staked the whole existence of Athens; and, having decided for this, he rightly resists any attempt to combine it with other incompatible suggestions, such as that the κρέα or 'meat' means the Athenian corpses, which after the battle were not picked up, a conception which certainly would seem little likely to gain popularity in Athens. Why the view preferred by Dr. Blaydes does not unite all votes, it is easy to see. Even if we grant the likelihood that either before or after the victory the Athenian populace would confess so frankly, not to say so grossly, their

desperate peril, and compare their country to a hare nearly run down, even then there is no particular point in applying the phrase to the special case of the slaves. Something of this kind, something proper to the slaves, is what the context requires. This is recognized by a note in the scholium: ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ δοῦλοι τότε νευανμάχοντες περὶ οὐδενὸς ἄλλου ἢ περὶ τῶν ἰδίων κρεῶν, τοῦτεστι σωμάτων. φησὶν οὖν οἷον οὐ περὶ χρημάτων ἢ πατρίδος—an explanation however which has little else to recommend it. In fact, none of the suggestions made seem adequate, and as a little more guessing can do no harm, I will venture one of my own. The reward promised and given to the slaves who fought at Arginusae was their freedom and the citizenship of Athens, that is, the limited form of it known as the Plataean franchise. It is to this (so much is plain) that Charon here refers; in the lower world, as upon earth, these slave combatants have the privilege of the free. Therefore the words περὶ τῶν κρεῶν, if they are to square with the purpose, ought to describe the object for which the slaves fought, that is, the freedom and the citizenship. Now the formal registration and enrolment of new citizens took place at the *Apaturia* (early in October). The battle of Arginusae was fought in July. Even before the battle it would be natural enough that the slaves should be described as fighting for the chance of participation in the approaching feast of citizenship. After the battle such an association of ideas could hardly be missed; for, as every one will remember, the tragic events which followed the battle were determined by the proceedings at this feast, and by the appearance there in mourning of those whose relatives by (or without) the fault of the generals were lost. At that same feast those slaves who survived must have appeared to partake for the first time of the Athenian communion, of which the sign was the eating of the sacrificial meat (τὰ κρέα ἐξ Ἀπατουρίων, *Thesm.* 558). The new citizen, in Aristophanes' own words (*Ach.* 146),

ἦρα φαγεῖν ἀλλήλτας ἐξ Ἀπατουρίων.

It would seem therefore a very natural piece of slang to say that the battle of Arginusae illustrated in a novel sense the proverb of 'racing for your meat', and to describe the slave combatants as 'having fought' on this occasion 'for their meat'.

To the extent of raising the disputable questions and presenting the materials for a judgment, Dr. Blaydes's commentary is very seldom defective. One place, in which

a known difficulty has escaped remark, may be noted here for the interest of the question itself. It is where Euripides bids Aeschylus recite 'the prologue from the *Oresteia*', and Aeschylus replies by commencing that of the *Choephori* (v. 1124):

EYP. πρῶτον δέ μοι τὸν ἐξ Ὀρεστέας λέγε.

ΔΙ. ἄγε δὴ σῶπα πᾶς ἀνὴρ. λέγ', Αἰσχύλε.

ΑΙ. Ἐρμῇ χθόνιε πατρῷ ἐποπτεύων κράτη...

Dr. Blaydes takes the Ὀρεστέα here to mean the trilogy or tetralogy, and does not explain how in that case Aeschylus can possibly understand the request to recite 'the prologue from the *Oresteia*', or how he infers, without more said, that it is the prologue to the second play which is asked for, and not that to the first or that to the third. Kock and Merry are also silent. The question has been put more than once, but I have seen no answer to it. The truth I take to be that there is no possible answer, and that the name *Oresteia* here cannot mean the trilogy but must mean what we call the *Choephori*. Nor is this at all strange. The *Oresteia*, or *Act of Orestes*, is a very good name for the play, a better name decidedly than that by which it goes now. It is that part of the story, the only part, in which Orestes is the leading figure; and the title *Oresteia* has the same application to it as the Homeric titles *Diomedea*, &c., to the books so called. Many indications conspire to show (what is likely enough in itself) that the titles of plays in the extinct *didascaliae*, by whomsoever and whensoever settled, were certainly not fixed and current from the first production of the plays. I have given, for example, elsewhere my reasons for thinking it impossible to attribute to Aeschylus the title of the *Seven against Thebes*. But the piece of evidence before us is singularly simple, complete, and interesting. It is to my mind plain as words can make it that Aristophanes and his contemporaries knew our *Choephori* as the *Oresteia*; and it is a natural, if not a necessary, inference from his language that he did not know that name as the title of the whole 'trilogy'. The fact is highly suggestive, but this is not the proper occasion for pursuing the subject.

In explaining the obscure citation itself, the editor has apparently not had before him the suggestion of Mr. Macnaghten, that in reality πατρῷ represents not πατρῶα at all, as Aristophanes advisedly or negligently assumes, but πατρῶς.

For the settlement of the text there remains, after the present edition, very much to be done in the way of distinguishing and

valuing the various documents. But the conclusions of Mr. Blaydes seem to be in general sober and acceptable in themselves. In v. 20 for instance—

ὦ τρισκακοδαίμων ἄρ' ὁ τράχηλος οὔτοσι,
ὅτι θλίβεται μὲν, τὸ δὲ γέλοιον οὐκ ἐρεί—

he is probably right in accepting ὅτε from Palmer, and also in declining ἐρῶ from Cobet. In v. 54, πόθος | τὴν καρδίαν ἐπάταξε πῶς οἶε σφόδρα. (*sic*), his punctuation seems to represent the linguistic fact better than the rival πῶς οἶε; σφόδρα. or, πῶς οἶε σφόδρα; On the unlucky v. 607 (ΞΑ. οὐκ ἐς κόρακας; μὴ πρόσσιτον. ΑΙ. εἰεν, καὶ μάχει); which has been altered and repunctuated in more ways than there are words, I do not altogether like either the editor's first thought (ἐς κόρακας. οὐ μὴ πρόσσιτον;—εἰεν, καὶ μάχει); or his second (οὐκ ἐς κόρακας; οὐ μὴ πρόσσιτον;—ἢ καὶ μάχει). Elmsley had reason for wishing to take οὐ μὴ πρόσσιτον together: but this need not involve any change of the words or order. We should write οὐκ ἐς κόρακας μὴ πρόσσιτον;—εἰεν, καὶ μάχει; and regard the oath ἐς κόρακας as a parenthesis (like the Latin ejaculatory *malum*) in the grammatical construction of οὐ μὴ πρόσσιτον.

In v. 796 the editor betrays suspicion of a phrase which has before struck me as dubious. The slave Aeacus has just informed the slave Xanthias of the circumstances which have led to the proposed contest between the tragic poets, how the 'rascally mob' supported the pretensions of Euripides and insisted upon a trial, how Sophocles made no claim against Aeschylus, but reserved himself to contest, if necessary, the victory of Euripides. Then says Xanthias, τὸ χρήμ' ἄρ' ἔσται; to which Aeacus replies, νῆ Δί', ὀλίγον γ' ὕστερον. κἀνταῦθα δὴ τὰ δεινὰ κινήσεται. Dr. Blaydes suggests δειν' ἄττα, citing v. 925, ῥήματα ὀφρῶς ἔχοντα καὶ λόφους, δειν' ἄττα μορμωπά, scarcely, I think, a parallel case. But certainly τὰ δεινὰ κινήσεται, 'the terrors' or 'the marvels will be set to work', is an odd expression in itself, and there is nothing in the preceding context to prepare the way for it or explain it to the ear. I have long thought that the accentuation is wrong and should be corrected to τὰ δῆνα. 'And so,' says Xanthias, in the slovenly jargon of gossip, 'the thingummy is to come off?' 'Yes,' replies Aeacus in the same style, 'directly'; and this is where the *thingumbobs* are to work. Xanthias means the contest, Aeacus the performances of the rival artists (which he compares to an exhibition of puppets or machines), and both

express their meaning with the like indifference to classic precision.

It would take of course ten times the space now available to discuss half the little questions of this kind suggested by the play and by the editor's critical notes. We must return to the commentary, and conclude with a few more notes on points which still need clearing up. V. 158—

ΔΙ. οὔτοι δὲ δὴ τίνας εἰσὶν; HP. οἱ μεμνημένοι,
ΞΑ. νῆ· τὸν Δί', ἐγὼ γοῦν ὄνος ἄγων μυστήρια.

Xanthias, impatient of his burden, interrupts the conversation. The proverb points *ἐπὶ τῶν εἰς οὐδὲν δέον ἀθροφούντων* (Eustathius), or, as it is put more precisely by Fritzsche and Holden, to those who *themselves* get no good out of their trouble. The editor follows them here rightly, but not in incorporating the guess of the scholium that the 'ass performing a mystery' referred specially to the conveyance of luggage by asses to Eleusis. There is nothing in the phrase which points to the Eleusinia, nor any proof of connexion between asses and that feast. The 'ass' here meant is the same which plays so remarkable a part in the story of Lucian, the ass which regularly accompanied those strolling quacks who preached the lower kinds of 'ritual.' He carried of course their necessities, but he also had, or was supposed to have, a connexion with their 'rites', as is shown by the tenacity of the association in the public mind between the animal and Oriental superstition, of which the most notorious example is the strange Roman blunder about the religions of the Jew and the Christian. The allusion of Aristophanes carries the tradition back much earlier. But Greece and Athens were already full of strange and only too popular religions from the East, the Sabazian rite, the Adonian, and what not.

V. 168—

μίσθωσαί τινα
τῶν ἐκφερομένων, ὅστις ἐπὶ τοῦτ' ἔρχεται.

'*ἐπὶ τοῦτ' ἔρχεται*': sc. ad bajulandum, *ἐπὶ τὸ σκευοφορεῖν*' (Blaydes). This is surely not right, and the scholium *ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκφορὰν* still less. Nor is there any reason to suspect error. The editor has overlooked the end of Mr. Merry's note, 'or *ἐπὶ τοῦτο* may be the intention of a journey to Hades.' Certainly it is. It was evidently a common saying that the best person to employ on an errand is *ὅστις ἐπὶ τοῦτ' ἔρχεται*, 'one who is on his way for the matter,' i.e. one who can do it without going out of his way. Here, 'the matter' being the carrying of luggage to

Hades, the *ὅστις* would be a νεκρὸς ἐκφερόμενος. The difficulty has arisen from seeking for *ἐπὶ τοῦτο* a special explanation in the words of the immediate context, whereas *τοῦτο* is simply τὸ παρόν, 'the matter in hand' (*τοῦτο* as opposed to any *ἐκείνο*), and is, like *ὅστις*, strictly general, though in reference to this case it has the meaning determined by the circumstances.

V. 320—

οἱ μεμνημένοι
ἐνταυθα πον παίζουσιν, ὡς ἔφραζε νῶν.
ἀδουσι γοῦν τὸν Ἰακχὸν ὄνπερ Διαγόρας.

Dr. Blaydes leaves this allusion in the obscurity where it is only too likely to remain. There had been, in the generation before Aristophanes, a lyric poet Diagoras; there was also a notorious 'atheist' of that name, who is said to have satirized the mysteries; and it is possible, though it would seem not likely, that they were the same person. But why, taking either to be meant here, an Athenian should identify the familiar song of the Eleusinian mystae as 'that which Diagoras sings' (for the only word which can be applied is *ἀδει*), remains itself a mystery. Aristarchus is cited by the scholium for the reading and the explanation (if such it can be called); but it may well be doubted whether he knew anything more about the passage than we do. There is probably some objection, which escapes me, to the neglected view of Apollodorus of Tarsus (see the scholium) that the true reading is *δι' ἀγορᾶς*, and the meaning simply that the mystae in Elysium are singing the same song which they sing 'through the agora', as they go out of the city by the Cerámicus on their way to Eleusis. This certainly fits admirably the beginning of the song itself, 'O Iacchus, who hast *here* thine honoured dwelling-place', which all refer to the temple in the Cerámicus sacred to Iacchus with Demeter and Coré. Evidently the song has begun (off the stage) before Xanthias speaks, and we might well suppose that it is actually by this characteristic *ἐνθάδε ναίων* that he identifies the song as that of the Athenian worship.

V. 367—

τοὺς μισθοὺς ῥήτωρ ὢν εἴτ' ἀποτρέγει.

"Anglice in the capacity of a public speaker (bringing forward some motion to promote national economy), ut explicat Merry.' Mr. Blaydes does injustice to the Rector, who adds as an alternative 'though he was a public speaker and might have

been expected to support rather than starve the poets', and adds further that 'the latter explanation is favoured by εἶτα.' It is proved by εἶτα, which does not admit the other at all. It is the specialty of the offence, that the rewards of literature should be attacked by one who was himself winning money, some of it public money, by his literary talents.

V. 467—

ὅς τὸν κύν' ἡμῶν ἐξελάσας τὸν Κέρβερον
ἀπῆξας ἄγχιον κάποδράς ὄχον λαβών.

Upon ἐξελάσας there is nothing in the commentary, but that the word does not quite satisfy the editor he shows by citing in the apparatus the conjecture of Reiske ἐξελόν. The natural doubt arising from the unsuitable sense of the word may be fortified

by observing that this nineteen-line speech of Aeacus, tragic in tone and for the most part actual parody, is written throughout in tragic metre, except in the word ἐξελάσας, which gives an anapaest in the fourth foot. The oversight, for such it must be, is not probable; and, if ἐξελόν is not near enough, I would suggest ἐσελάσας, *having invaded us*.

Here must be closed a discussion which with the copious assistance of Dr. Blaydes I would gladly pursue much further, but that I fear to weary even his own minute patience. It remains only to wish him all success in the completion of his long and serviceable task. '*Nubes mox prodibit. Equites sub prelo. Vespaë*':

σφήκωμα τοῦτίκρανον ὡς τάχιστ' ἔχοι.

A. W. VERRALL.

SCHOLIA TO SOPHOCLES.

Scholia in Sophoclis Tragoediis Vetera e codice Laurentiano denuo collato edidit commentario critico instruxit indices adjecit
PETRUS N. PAPAGEORGIUS. Lipsiae, 1888.
4 Mk. 80.

It is not easy to discover a reason for the existence of this book. The compiler has little good to say of previous editors of the scholia of Sophocles, but the list of their mistakes by which he supports his criticism hardly justifies the way in which he speaks of scholars such as Elmsley and Brunck and editors such as Dübner. His own fitness to undertake so difficult a task is by no means apparent. If his intention was to supply an accurate and trustworthy text of the scholia for other men to use, he might most successfully have effected his purpose by taking the best existing or most accessible text and telling us exactly the points in which it is in error. Even this a scholar with any right to use scholia might now do for himself, seeing that an excellent facsimile of the Laurentian Codex has lately been produced under the competent editorship of Mr. Maunde Thompson and Professor Jebb. As it is, Mr. Papageorgius's book provides none of those precise palaeographical notices which are so necessary for all work on scholia; and without such aids it is immeasurably inferior to the facsimile. Then, on the other hand, if the end in view was to edit the scholia in the higher sense of getting at

their meaning, the editor has no less signally failed. Yet, that this was his intention is, I think, plain not only from his preface but also from the nature of the editing to which he has subjected the text. He has a system of brackets by which he distinguishes the omissions and insertions made by himself, and at the end he gives two lists, the one called *Index emendationum editoris*, and the other *Index conjecturarum incertarum*. Now it is no exaggeration to say that many of his changes, insertions and omissions are most misleading. Some of them are altogether uncalled for, as for example the insertion of the word κλυτᾶς in the lemma ἔκγονα χθονός to a scholium on O.R. 172. The scholium ἡ τὰ δένδρα ἡ τοὺς παῖδας φησι is a note on ἔκγονα χθονός and not on ἔκγονα κλυτᾶς χθονός: yet the editor imagines that he has made an improvement by inserting the adjective. If all his changes were as harmless as this, it would not matter much; but sometimes by his omissions and insertions he would deprive the scholia of the marks by which their origin and significance can be best understood. Scholia, as we now have them, often consist of several ancient notes all run together into a meaningless sentence by means of particles such as καὶ and δὲ and γάρ. Sometimes however the particle has not been inserted and sometimes even the ancient initial ὅτι has been left in the middle of such a sentence to show the way in which it has been

put together. Now Mr. Papageorgius constantly improves away these most valuable marks. e.g. in *Ajax* 38 he inserts a δέ to join into one two distinct scholia, and reads ἐν τοῖς ἀμοιβαίοις κατὰ βραχὺ δηλοῦται ἢ ὑπόθεσις, πυνθάνεται <δὲ> πρῶτον εἰ ἄρα πρὸς καιρὸν ποινῶ. εἰ γὰρ αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν φόνον δράσας πρὸς καιρὸν ἂν εἴη ποινῶν ὁ Ὀδυσσεύς. Again on *O.R.* 89 he would omit a most eloquent ὅτι. The scholium runs ἔστιν δὲ ποῖον τοῦτος; : ὅτι ἀσαφὴ τὸν λόγον εἶπεν [ὅτι] ἀξιοῖ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ῥητοῦ ἀκοῦσαι. Here any one with any knowledge of scholia sees at once that we have two old notes (possibly each an explanation of the same editorial mark) run together into one sentence as is constantly being done by the later scribes. Yet the last editor would deprive us of one means of

separating the explanation ὅτι ἀσαφὴ τὸν λόγον εἶπεν from the explanation ὅτι ἀξιοῖ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ῥητοῦ ἀκοῦσαι. Similarly on *Ant.* 18 ἦδεν καλῶς : ἀντὶ τοῦ ἦδεα καὶ ἦδεν σε καλῶς τὰ τοιαῦτα μὴ πολυπραγμονοῦσαν he asks us to omit the καί. But what is to be said of the condition of mind of an editor who would strain at this gnat of a particle and swallow the camel ἦδεν in the lemma?

These instances do not stand alone. Similar mistakes and misconceptions may be found not only on every page, but almost in every paragraph. If scholia are as this editor represents them to be, there is nothing to be gained by preserving them, but on the contrary they had better be entirely neglected.

W. GUNION RUTHERFORD.

STUEMUND'S ANECDOTA VARIA.

Anecdota Varia Graeca et Latina, ediderunt
RUD. SCHOELL et GUIL. STUEMUND.
Volume I, Berlin 1886. 10 Mk.

THE very miscellaneous contents of this volume fall mainly under three divisions according as they deal with metre, music or mythology. The first of these forms the larger and more important part of the book, and of this the most valuable portions are the contributions to the study of the Scholia on Hephaestion. In the *Rheinisches Museum* vol. xxxvi pp. 260 ff. it was shown by Hoerschelmann that a commentary on Hephaestion which in the MSS. exists in the form of a continuous treatise had hitherto been concealed in the editions of the *ἐγχειρίδιον* amongst the Scholia, in a fragmentary and dismembered condition. This commentary, which Hoerschelmann attributes to Choeroboscus, he has published in this volume, with a collation of three MSS., only one of which, the Bodleian 'Saibantianus,' was known to Gaisford. The other two MSS., a Venetian and a Vatican, have been for the first time collated by Stuemund. The Saibantianus appears to be a copy of the Venetian MS.; the Vatican is independent and differs considerably from the others. There is little, if anything, in this first complete edition of the commentary which was not already known, for the greater part had been already published in the form of extracts by Gaisford and the remainder contains no new information of any real

importance. The value of the edition is partly that it is based on a careful collation of good MSS., and partly that it throws a new light on the composition of the heterogeneous Scholia to Hephaestion, and so on the history of metrical tradition.

The commentary is followed by an edition by Stuemund of the so-called 'Scholia A' based on a collation of three MSS., viz. an Ambrosian MS. of the end of the 13th or beginning of the 14th century (called by Stuemund A), the Venetian MS. already mentioned, and an Ambrosian MS. of the 15th century (called by Stuemund Q). The Venetian MS. appears to be a copy of A, which in the opinion of Stuemund is the best of the existing MSS. of Hephaestion. As Hoerschelmann had already edited the 'Scholia B' (Dorpat 1882) there are now complete critical editions of all the Scholia to Hephaestion, based on good MSS., and thus an important beginning has been made towards the edition of a '*corpus metricorum Graecorum*' which has been promised by Hoerschelmann and Stuemund. In another chapter Stuemund gives the readings of A in all the quotations from the poets made by Hephaestion in the *ἐγχειρίδιον*, but the more important of these had been already communicated by Stuemund to Bergk for the third edition of the '*Lyrici Graeci*.' He also gives the readings of A in the 'Scholia B' where it differs from the Harleian MS. (O) collated by Hoerschelmann for his edition. These various readings

however do not supply any improvement of Hoerschelmann's text.

The remainder of the metrical portions of the volume consists of *anecdota* from various MSS. on various subjects. In these there is frequent repetition, and the information furnished by them is for the most part either already familiar, or of little value. The chief subjects dealt with are the following:—the 'κοινή συλλαβή,' synizesis, the different kinds and names of feet, the commonest metres, such as dactylic hexameters, elegiacs, iambs, anacreontics, the different forms of the hexameter according to the number and varying positions of the dactyls and the spondees, the different kinds of hexameters which are in appearance metrically defective, the various caesuras. One of these anonymous writings (contained in an Ambrosian MS.) gives a list of names for different metrical combinations of five and six syllables, which suggests some corrections in the text of the similar list of pentasyllabic "feet" given by the Latin grammarian Diomedes. It is supplemented by another list of pentasyllabic and hexasyllabic 'feet' (which however is of little value) extracted from a Berlin MS. and printed in the addenda. Interspersed with these metrical 'anecdota' are some of a lexicographical character, the most considerable being a list of Greek words for

the cries of animals, which is given in slightly different forms from several MSS.

The musical portion of the volume consists of an edition by Adolf Stamm of three very short Greek treatises (from a Laurentian MS.) containing *κατατομαὶ κανόνος*, i.e. divisions of the string into the lengths required for producing different notes in the scale. The editor has printed the text of the MS. and also a corrected text accompanied by translations both in Latin and in German, a critical and exegetical commentary, and an account of the various instruments used by the ancient theorists for measuring the ratios corresponding to the different concords and discords. The text of the first of these *κατατομαὶ* is very corrupt, but it has been corrected by the editor (with the assistance especially of C. von Jan) with great ingenuity, and in most cases with almost absolute certainty.

The mythological section consists of Greek lists of the epithets applied to the twelve chief deities, i.e. Zeus, Apollo, Poseidon, Ares, Dionysus, Hephaestus, Hermes, Athene, Hera, Aphrodite, Demeter, Artemis, edited by Studemund from three different but closely connected sources. In these lists will be found several epithets which appear to be otherwise unknown.

C. B. HEBERDEN.

DUFF'S LUCRETIIUS, Book V.

T. Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura Liber Quintus. Edited with Introduction and Notes by J. D. DUFF, M.A. Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge, at the University Press. 1889. 2s.

THIS school edition of the fifth book of Lucretius does not make any claim to original treatment of the text or matter. It will however be found exceedingly useful by beginners who are not advanced enough to use Munro's notes. The introduction gives a brief and clear account, without going into any debatable ground, of what is known of the poet's life, of the general scope of the poem and its position in Latin literature, especially in relation to Virgil: an outline of the Epicurean philosophy abridged from Zeller; and a section explaining the more simple terms of astronomy so far as they are treated of in the book. The text generally follows Munro's

last edition. The notes are very full and careful, too full indeed to leave much to the discretion or invention of the teacher. What amount of help in notes is desirable in a schoolbook is a question mainly for schoolmasters to decide: but there can be no doubt that this edition, if it errs, errs on the side of over-copiousness and leaving too little to the schoolboy's intelligence. A few examples of unnecessary notes will make it plain what I mean. After rightly saying on l. 139 that *videri* often requires, and usually can bear, the meaning 'be seen' in Lucr., Mr. Duff goes on, the first time only ten lines later, and thereafter almost as often as the word occurs (I have counted eight instances) to repeat '*videtur* is passive.' The term *boves Lucae* explained on l. 1302 is surely striking enough to remain in even an average schoolboy's mind till he gets to l. 1339. Sometimes needless translations are given: '*exitium*, utter destruction,' '*consilio*,

by design,' *'ratione pari, in like manner,'* *'donum, boon,'* *'commune bonum spectare, to consider the common weal,'* It may be held with some reason that such notes really do harm rather than good. Another class of notes are no doubt useful in themselves but better left to a composition class: those I mean which give the Greek equivalent of a Latin phrase by way of explaining it: *'unum = τὸν μόνον,'* *'δύο τέμνει ἀνὰ τμήματα τὴν ὁδόν'* as a comment on l. 684, *'abuti* often = *καταχρῆσθαι*, *'adulanti = σαίροντι*, *'adversum, ἐναντίον*, *'gessit = ἐφόρησε*, *'in altum = εἰς πλάτος*. What have these notes to do with Lucretius? On the other hand it must be said that there are very few instances indeed where a necessary note is omitted. One or two might perhaps be added: on *extiterint* l. 69 (the use of the verb, which might puzzle a beginner, is not explained till l. 797): a fuller note on the meaning of *ruere* l. 96: on *mirum si* l. 192; but these omissions, if they are such, are quite trifling.

I add a list of notes which in some cases are open to question and in others clearly wrong: l. 73 *insinuarit* is transitive, and the construction precisely the same as in l. 44: l. 110 *fata* = sayings, not decrees of fate: l. 149 *animi mente* does not mean 'the reasoning of the mind'; *mens* never = reasoning; the genitive is of the same kind as those noted on l. 369: l. 190 *omnimodis* is not formed by false analogy from *multimodis* any more than *omniparens*: l. 697 *sub terris*, abl. because the sun is stopped; the whole point of the argument is that the sun is not stopped but moves slowly: l. 811 *ibi* cannot = *ad eum locum*, which would be *eo*; it is the correlative to *ubi* in l. 807: l. 1093 *inde* not = *a fulmine*, but = *a primo igne*: l. 1260 the note, perhaps from a mere carelessness of expression, implies that the relative pronoun can be omitted in Latin as it is omitted in the English phrase 'the man I saw' for 'the man whom I saw.'

The following translations are not good: l. 253 *'nubes, wreaths'*; it means clouds of dust, and one does not even speak of wreaths of dust except in a different sense: l. 280 *'fluere, to ebb,'* in the phrase *fluere omnia constat*: l. 286 *succedere* does not mean 'to pass beneath' but 'to come up to': l. 309 *numen*, not 'sacredness,' but the deity in the temple: l. 334 *melicos sonores*, not 'musical tunes' but 'tuneful sounds': l. 457 *rara (foramina)*, not 'porous' pores, but slender: l. 615 *partibus*, not 'positions' but regions, i.e. the part of the celestial sphere filled by

the summer signs of the zodiac: l. 657 *pandit*, not 'opens up' but spreads: l. 695 *notarunt*, not 'have mapped out' but have marked: l. 850 *procedere*, not 'to continue' but to forge out: l. 1133 *sapiunt*, not 'get their knowledge' but taste, in the literal sense: l. 1340 *'fera facta, cruel sufferings'*; *facta* cannot ever mean sufferings; here *dedere fera facta* obviously means 'dealt fierce doings.'

Some explanatory notes rather darken counsel than otherwise. The note on l. 516 is so curious that I must transcribe it at length. 'Water flowing beneath a wheel must turn the upper side of the wheel in the opposite direction to the course of the water; the haustia, "scoops," have nothing to do with turning the wheel; that is done by the current; the scoops attached to the wheel are mentioned here only because they are fastened to the wheel as the stars are to the sphere of heaven.' The editor is so anxious to point out, what is true enough, that the scoops will not turn the wheel if there is no water, that he appears to have forgotten the equally elementary fact that the water will not turn the wheel if there are no scoops. On l. 727 he says the *Chaldaei* were the successors of Berosus. In what sense had Berosus successors? and why should Chaldaean astronomy be made to begin about 250 B.C.? Another curious scientific note is on l. 798: 'it was long believed that horse-hairs sealed up in a bottle of water became eels, but modern science seems to have exploded this theory.'

Notes where a statement is a little loosely made are l. 103, *'templa = loca* in old Latin'; l. 121, *'notantes, blaming, used technically of the censors'* (it simply means 'marking' here): l. 134 *'quod si, but if'* (it should be explained that *quod* is abl. and means 'in which matter'; it is the same word as occurs lower down l. 916 *nam quod multa fuere*, where the note is '*quod, the fact that*'): l. 199 *'stat = constat = est'*, much too sweeping an assertion: l. 1163 *'sollemnis* is connected with *annus*'; the full derivation might be given.

There are two passages where I venture to differ from Mr. Duff though he has the great authority of Munro behind him. The first is l. 258

Praeterea pro parte sua quodcumque alid
auget
Redditur

The note here is '*redditus, has restitution made to it; a strange use of the word.*' It is indeed, as Munro admits, not only strange

but unexampled. It seems more probable that *redditur* = *reddit se*, gives itself up *se* to increase the other. The other passage is l. 569, *nil ad speciem est contractior ignis*. Munro and Mr. Duff translate 'to the eye.' It is very questionable whether *species* ever means the eye or the seeing power (*opsis*): and here it is surely better to make it keep its usual sense 'in appearance,' 'so far as its outward visible form is concerned.'

It may seem ungracious to find many small faults. I ought to add that the notes are, as I have found by actual experiment, very clear and helpful to one who is not far advanced in Latin. The printing has been carefully done: I have only noted two

misprints of any consequence, one in the note to l. 176 where a necessary word is missed out, the other in the text of l. 1436 where a different reading is printed from the one commented on in the note. I do not know whether a curious use of the symbol '*sc.*' meaning apparently what old commentators expressed by the word *subaudi* (e.g. l. 143, 156) is a new fashion or not. There is one material error in the introduction: 'even the few, who ventured to disparage Virgil, do not seem to have set up Lucretius as a rival object of admiration.' This was precisely what they did, according to the author of the *Dial. de Or.* c. 23.

J. W. M.

MASTER VIRGIL.

Master Virgil: the Author of the Aeneid as he seemed in the Middle Ages. A series of studies by J. S. TUNISON. Cincinnati, 1888. 10s.

MR. TUNISON'S primary object in writing this series of studies is to supply a want in the literature of a subject which has had more attraction for Continental than for English and American scholars, viz. the legends which grew round the name of the poet Virgil in the Middle Ages. The admirable work of Comparetti, *Virgilio nel medio evo*, of the contents of which Mr. Tunison gives a succinct analysis at pp. 228-9, is the book on the subject which has received most attention in this country. He acknowledges his indebtedness also to Zappert's *Virgils Leben und Fortleben im Mittelalter*, and he refers to other writings in French and German, such as those of Du Meril, Genthe and Roth: but he observes with justice that 'writers in English were not among the number of those who had discussed the subject with any fulness or clearness.' It is one which, in detail at least, has more interest for students of the superstitions and crude literary fancies of the Middle Ages than for classical scholars; and probably many English readers have got their earliest impression of Virgil as 'the magician' from the notes to the 'Lay of the Last Minstrel.'

But the persistence of Virgil's name and fame even in tales so repugnant to the perfect sanity and sobriety of his own imagination is interesting as a testimony to the extraordinary spell exercised by his genius and spiritual nature: a spell not confined to his own age or country, or to ages enjoying a similar culture and civilization, but extending to those which in the outward conditions of life and in modes of thought were as remote as possible from the Augustan age or from our own days. The finest recognition of that spell and of its origin is to be found in the often-quoted words of Cardinal Newman (*Grammar of Assent*, p. 75): 'Perhaps this is the reason of the mediaeval opinion about Virgil as if a prophet or magician: his single words and phrases, his pathetic half-lines, giving utterance as the voice of nature herself to that pain and weariness yet hope of better things which is the experience of her children in every time.' Though the fact that Virgil lived in the imagination of a time so alien from that in which and for which he wrote enhances our sense of the catholicity of his genius, yet nothing is gained for our appreciation and enjoyment of the true Virgil by a minute knowledge of the stories which gathered round his name as they did around those of some of the Roman emperors, and also round those of various men remarkable for

¹ Among these notes we find the following. 'In a very rare romance, "which treateth of the life of Virgilius and of his deth, and many marveilles that he dyd in his life-time by wychecraft and nigroman-

cy, through the help of the devyls of Hell," &c.; and Sir Walter goes on to tell one of the most grotesque of these legends, the mode in which Virgil renovated his youth by magical arts.

their superior knowledge in the Middle Ages.

Mr. Tunison has supplied a want in giving for the first time in English a collection of these tales, which, if not of great interest to classical scholars, must be of value to students of the origin of mediæval romance. He is probably right in his contention that they are not the product of Italian tradition, but were due to the nations north of the Alps. They have all the characteristics of the Teutonic as distinct from the Italian imagination. But Mr. Tunison appeals also to the curiosity of classical students in his attempt to connect these grotesque Teutonic fancies of magic and demonology and humorous love-adventures with the traditions of Virgil's life, the personal traits recorded of him, and some salient characteristics of his poetry. His purpose is, in his own words, 'to account for every legendary fragment in its own place,' to 'show the literary rather than the popular genesis for the special fiction in which the name of Virgil figures,'—'the relation between the phases of Virgil's character, as it appears to his contemporaries and early critics, and the various legends.' It is on this attempt to connect the various phases of the Virgilian legend with what is known of the true Virgil, to show that 'his magical reputé is the creation of a conscious purpose and not the offspring of the imaginative instinct, in which folk-lore originates,' that Mr. Tunison rests his claim to originality and the chief value of his series of studies. Is he successful in this attempt, and does he show himself a sound interpreter and judicious critic of the traditions of Virgil's personality, and of the impress of that personality stamped upon his poetry?

He starts with a proposition (p. 6) which certainly will not gain general assent, and which he assumes as needing only to be asserted, that 'considered as literature, and not as a mere philological stalking-horse, the poems of Virgil were widely read and as well understood in the Twelfth century as they are to-day.' This seems hardly consistent with what he says at p. 55: 'not less unreal was the conception of Virgil embodied in the romances of the Twelfth century. The poets of the vernacular languages thought of him as a learned clerk in the midst of a feudal society, composed of dukes, barons, bishops, court-ladies, damsels, knights, yet not without reminiscence of his fame as a poet.' Surely such a conception of him is incompatible with a widely diffused appreciation of his poetry as sane as that which educated

men have in the present day. Probably every age reads something of itself into the great literary works of the past; and that they admit of this without any serious distortion of their true meaning is one of the chief sources of their perennial interest; but it is a bold assertion that nothing has been gained except in grammatical and philological knowledge by the advances in literary criticism made in the last four centuries.

Mr. Tunison classifies the legends, which he has collected with great diligence, under the following heads: Virgil as the devil, Virgil in literary tradition, the magician, the man of science, the saviour of Rome, the lover, the prophet. He is probably right in holding that the germs of the effect he had on the imagination of the later world were latent in the conceptions formed of him by his contemporaries and by his admirers in the times immediately following his own. As he says, 'It is difficult to imagine that an easy-going man of the world like Horace should become the subject of a literary myth.' He might have said the same of Cicero, who was the only Roman writer whose literary preeminence could be at all compared with that of Virgil. But neither Horace nor Cicero nor any other Latin writer acted on the imagination of the Roman world with that sense of something mystic, something appertaining to another sphere, with which Virgil, even in his lifetime, affected the imagination of his countrymen: and if Mr. Tunison had been satisfied with showing that some memory of this impression caused the marvellous legends which grew out of the contact of the young nations of the modern world with the surviving memorials of ancient civilization to cluster round his name rather than that of any other ancient writer, most people would have agreed with him. But he has gone much beyond this, and professes to give almost a scientific explanation of the genesis of each set of legends, and to connect it with some special trait or characteristic of the poet recognized by his contemporaries. Thus he remarks, 'They' (his countrymen) 'attributed to him an extraordinary knowledge of Roman priestcraft. By the natural mutation of words under the influence of a new religion, this came to mean that he was versed in demonology.' 'Thus a whole romance, an entire web of legend may be woven, indeed has been woven, out of the potentialities of a single word.' No further proof is indicated of the connexion between Virgil's undoubtedly large acquaintance with the pontifical lore and ritual, and the part he played along with

Michael Scott, Faust, Friar Bacon and others who had no knowledge of such lore, in the demonology of the middle ages. We have to remember that the spirit of early Christianity was antagonistic not only to the beliefs and rites of Paganism, but to much that was most admirable in the intellectual gains of antiquity. Professor Nichol in the very interesting account which he gives, in the second part of his *Life and Philosophy of Bacon*, of the condition of Science before the time of Bacon, after noticing the contempt expressed by some of the early Fathers for secular learning, adds: 'The emperors of the age allied themselves with the same obscurantism. Constantine, fresh from his politic conversion, closed the schools, dispersed the libraries, and *allowed science to be branded as magic*.' As the darkness of the ages which followed the overthrow of the ancient civilization deepened, and as the spirit of the northern nations asserted itself more and more as a factor of belief, magic came to be associated with diabolic agency. And thus the vague conception or tradition of Virgil, as the exponent of the knowledge and culture of the most enlightened era of Roman civilization, gradually passed into that of 'Virgilius,' performing marvels 'by wyche-crafte and nigromancye through the help of the devyls of Hell.'

The supremacy of Virgil in literary tradition so long as any sane understanding of ancient literature survived is adduced as an explanation of the mediæval conception of him, as 'a small withered personage who, as men of learning were in the habit of doing, with head bent, looked upon the ground continually, as if in deep thought.' The life of the poet attributed to Donatus affords evidence of a growth of myths and anecdotes around his name, due originally to the invention of grammarians and commentators who had a real knowledge and admiration of his poetry; and this genuine appreciation survived amongst a few men of learning and of sane judgment through the darkest ages. But the conception of him in the popular romances of the twelfth century is absolutely incompatible with any true knowledge or sane appreciation either of his poetry or personality. He was to the authors of these a great name, representative of a vague ideal of study and learning; and they embodied this ideal in a figure suggested by that of the students and scholars of whom they caught casual glimpses in the world in which they moved.

The conception of him as a man of science,

which passed into that of a magician, is not traced by Mr. Tunison to the indications of scientific study and curiosity scattered through the *Georgics*, but is explained by a conjecture as to the wonder which his advancement and the favours which he received from Pollio and Octavianus must have excited among the peasantry of his native district. 'To their rude minds the real cause of Virgil's advancement would not have suggested itself save in connexion with something which bore an air of utility. Now one of the circumstances which conferred a superstitious value on poetry among the ancients was its supposed relation to medicine.' This he attempts to establish by the early use of songs and chants as charms to cure wounds. Surely all this is rather arbitrary conjecture than scientific explanation of the germ out of which the mediæval conception of Virgil as a man of science and magician arose. The name of Virgil, once recognized as one of intellectual preeminence, would naturally, in so uncritical an age, adapt itself to any vague conception of learning, science, or magic, without the originating impulse given by the crude fancies of the rustics in the district of Andes.

The legend of Virgil, as the *Saviour of Rome*, is connected by Mr. Tunison with the representation of Manlius on the shield of Aeneas, in the eighth book of the *Aeneid*. 'The Tarpeian citadel, the Capitol, the figure of the warrior and that of the bird whose cries aroused him from slumber were all depicted in such a way as to make one suspect that in these verses lay the germ of the fancy embodied in Neckam's tale about the temple and the statues which defended Rome.' It is difficult always to say what germ of actual fact may have set in motion the unconnected phantasmagoria of a vivid dream, and so it may be possible that a vague memory of this passage in the *Aeneid* may have originally started the fancy of 'a contrivance of one Virgil, who was a great magician,' who 'made a tower wherein were as many images as there are kingdoms in the world, and in the head of every image he put a bell, so that, if any nation designed to invade the Romans, the image of that province would ring his bell, &c.' But there seems to be no natural connexion between the representation of the shield and this later romance; and when the popular imagination had once seized on the idea of Virgil as a magician, it was able without any such suggestion to create its own world of marvellous adventure. If it is necessary to connect this legend, which has more of a

serious significance than most of the others, with any particular passage in the *Aeneid* or with any true perception of the purpose of that poem, it is simpler to connect it with the spirit of imperial patriotism which animates the whole work than with any identification of the poet with the 'guardian of the Tarpeian citadel.'

The legends of Virgil in the character of a lover Mr. Tunison supposes to spring out of the sense of the ludicrous that came to be associated with the character of the magician, 'like that of the devil in the mysteries,' and not to be connected with anything either in Virgil's life or his poetry. 'While Virgil's relations with women are unknown, his disposition towards them as evinced in his portrayal of Dido and Lavinia, gentle far beyond the measure of the Latin genius, is yet plainly that of good-natured contempt, mingled with the diffident and timid aversion of a confirmed bachelor.' This is hardly an adequate account of the treatment of the subject by the poet who in the *Eclogues* as well as in the fourth book of the *Aeneid* has shown a deeper and a worthier sense of the romance and passion of love than any other ancient writer. But here we have again to remember how all the grotesque imaginations of an uncritical age, endowed with a lively fancy, are apt to gather round some one central figure, however inappropriate it may be for their reception. In old Scotch jest books, the grave George Buchanan, the only man of learning whom Dr. Johnson would admit that Scotland had produced, is made the author of all the somewhat Fescennine railery in which the rustic humour of his countrymen manifested itself.

In the chapter on Virgil as a prophet, a conception which probably may have sprung out of the practice of consulting the 'Sortes Vergilianae,' dating from the time of Hadrian, Mr. Tunison contrasts the idea in the fourth *Eclogue* of 'a last golden age of the world when the simplicity and purity of the first men were to be recovered' with the 'satirical humour of Horace' (in the sixteenth *Epode*) 'at the expense of the high-wrought hopes of the Romans' (Syllabus of Contents p. iv). 'The less hopeful Horace, following the same line of thought, generally reminded the Romans that if they would realize such a dream of unmingled felicity they must go to a new world. Half in jest he proposed in his sixteenth *Epode* that they should all flee to the Fortunate Isles, binding themselves by a mutual oath never to return. . . . In all this

Horace meant to smile at the dreams which the Romans cherished, and which Virgil encouraged. He desired his readers to understand that there was no place on earth of unmingled blessedness. Above all, while they had the world to conquer and rule they must not hope for the enjoyment of un-laborious ease.' If this is the purpose of the sixteenth *Epode*, it is certainly very carefully disguised. Though some critics find a vein of irony running through the second *Epode*, in which Horace gives a condensed expression to that enjoyment of country life and labour and of the sights and sounds of outward Nature which inspired the composition of the *Georgics*, no one has hitherto attributed either to an ironical or a didactic purpose this dream of ideal peace and ease in some island of the ocean, which is the earliest and perhaps the most unreal of all Horace's serious compositions. The feelings and longings are very similar to, possibly suggested by, those expressed in the fourth *Eclogue* of Virgil. Both Virgil and Horace are giving a voice to the weariness of their generation with the civil wars, and their vague longing for a better and happier life. But while the deeper feeling of Virgil is moved by hopes of the new Empire, the deeper feeling of Horace is moved by despair of the fortunes of the Republic. Here he is not the ironical singer of the passing joys of life, nor yet the 'Musarum sacerdos' proclaiming lessons of duty or acquiescence to his countrymen, but rather, as in some of the *Odes* that strike the deepest note, the utterer of the 'Cea naenia' over the fall of the Republic.

The chief value of Mr. Tunison's studies is not that which he claims for them—the establishment of a rational bond of connexion between the legends which gathered round the name and memory of Virgil in the Middle Ages, and the personality of the poet as known from the evidence of contemporaries and others near his time, or as impressed on his poetry. It seems impossible to establish any such connexion, at least in detail, though there are a very few elements in some of the legends, as for instance the friendship of Augustus for Virgil

"(Dilecti tibi Vergilius Variusque poetae),"

which are in accordance with known facts. But if a scientific explanation of the genesis of these legends is to be attempted—though for such an attempt one might almost suggest the motto,

Nilo plus agas,

Quam sides operam ut cum ratione insanias—

it can only be done by a comparison with all the other crude beginnings of mediaeval romance. The value of Mr. Tunison's work—and that, notwithstanding my disagreement with many of his views, I think very considerable—is that it supplies materials

for such a study; and it has the further value that it is the only book in the English language which gives in any detail the legends themselves associated with the name of Virgil.

W. Y. SELLAR.

GREEK VERSION OF OVID'S *HEROIDES* BY PLANODES.

De Heroidum Ovidii codice Planudeo.
Scripsit ALFREDUS GUDEMAN, Americanus.
Berolini, 1888. 3 Mk.

THOUGH his translation of the *Metamorphoses* has been long known, by a curious fate the Greek version by Planudes of the *Heroides* has been hitherto unpublished. It is true this work had not escaped Nangerius, who quotes it on *H.* vi. 103, which Gudeman does not notice; but beyond Dilthey's disparaging account of one epistle (*De Callimachi Cydippe*, p. 139), we have as yet had no trustworthy information; and to Gudeman belongs the credit of first clearly demonstrating the value of this version, which has been transcribed for him from two MSS. by Dr. Treu. Planudes is here shown to have been a scrupulous translator, adhering usually even to the order of the words in his original; hence, if only he used a good MS., his work must be of great critical use. Though his Latin is not always as good as his Greek,—thus *degener* he connects apparently with *deus* and renders by *διογενής*,—still mistakes are rare; and the fidelity as a whole of his version is remarkable, even in such small points as the turning of the pronouns, *ille* being consistently rendered by *ἐκεῖνος*, *iste* by *οὗτος*, and *ipse* by *αὐτός*. By an exhaustive comparison of readings Gudeman shows that the Latin MS. used by Planudes, which he names D, came from the same archetype as all our MSS., that it is most nearly related to our best MS. P, though it represents a different stage of descent in the same family, that these two alone concur frequently in the genuine reading, though we are not surprised to find that D is often right where P is wrong, and the converse not seldom the case, that it belongs to a group totally different from our next best MS. G, to which it is superior, and that the same is the case to a greater extent with regard to all the other MSS. It is to be regretted that in the comparative tables Gudeman frequently gives the readings of D

in Latin as restored by him, omitting the Greek; we should like to see the Greek of the whole MS., as there are evidently some mistakes in his tables. Thus *H.* iii. 154 the Greek *δεσπότην τρόπον* shows that D read *more* not *iure*, about which Gudeman hesitates. iv. 124 *tollendi* is mistranslated *αἰξηθῆναι* by Planudes, thinking no doubt of such phrases as Horace's *tergeminis tollere honoribus*; there is no need with Gudeman to suppose that D read *augendi*, which will not scan. vi. 147 for *sospesque* *ἴσως* is given, whence Gudeman restores *fortasse*: rather, as is shown on p. 14, Planudes used a glossed

fortasse

MS., which read *tutus sospesque fuisset*: the *fortasse*, which was added, as is so common in Ovid MSS., to explain the subj., was mistaken by Planudes for a correction. vii. 160 *perque fugae comites, Dardana sacra, deos*: Gr. *πρὸς τῶν τῆς φυγῆς μετασχόντων σοι Δαρδανίων θεῶν*. Gudeman supposes that D had *Dardanioisque deos*; but where has the *-que* vanished to in the Greek? I suppose rather that the exegetic *Dardana sacra* is here merely paraphrased. ix. 145 *τίς ἐξέκαστε* points to *quis ussit* not *urit*. Gudeman prints the Greek of the whole of the fifth epistle with the Latin, as reconstructed, side by side; here again I think he is not always right, and his Greek MS. requires some correction: l. 1 *perlege! non est, ἀλλ' ἀναγίνωσκε. οὐδὲ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.* perhaps D read *sed lege*. l. 10 *edita de magno flumine nymphea fui, μεγάλου ποταμοῦ φύσα νύμφη*. Read *μεγάλου <ἀπὸ> ποταμοῦ*, the error being due to the avoidance of dittography, for Planudes is very careful with prepositions. l. 18 *tegeret, κρίπτει*. Read *κρίπτει*. l. 30 *recurrat, δρόμοι*. D read *recurrat*, a wish. l. 38 *gelidusque cucurrit, ut mihi narrasti, dure, per osea tremor, καὶ τρόμος ψυχρός, ὅτε μοι διαγῆσω, διέδραμε τὰ ὅσα*. Gudeman supposes that D omitted *dure*. Rather read *διαγῆσω, <ὡμὲ>, διέδραμε*. l. 45 *nostros flentis ocellos, τοὺς ἡμετέρους δακρυούσας ὀφθαλμούς*. Read *δακρυούσας*. l. 67 *terrasque cila ratis attigit*

aura, καὶ τῆς γῆς ὑπὸ ταχυνόις πνεύμασιν ἄπτεται ἡ ναῦς. D read clearly *terrasque citis ratis attigit auris*, perhaps rightly, as the sigmatism is quite Ovidian, cp. *M.* xiii. 397, xv. 169. *T.* ii. 538. l. 86 εἰσὶ μοι χεῖρες αἰς ἂν δύναιτο πρέπον τὸ σκῆπτρον. Read πρέπειν. l. 100 ἥτις οὕτω ταχύς ἐστράφη. Read ταχύ. In xiii. 60 for *quota quemque* P is read *quotacumque* by D = P², which I suspect is right; *quota quemque* arose from the spelling *quotacumque*, cp Bersu, *Die Gutturalen* p. 87. n. Gudeman shows in an interesting

section on the life of Planudes that his death is usually put too late, that he was born 1250-1260 A.D., translated the *Heroides* about 1295, and died not before 1302, and not long after 1310. The dissertation is scholarly, and we shall look forward with interest for fresh work from this young American: if he would publish the whole version of Planudes, he would do a great service to Philology.

S. G. OWEN.

LA RHÉTORIQUE ET SON HISTOIRE.

La Rhétorique et son Histoire. Par A. Ed. CHAIGNET. Paris, 1888. 10 frs.

M. CHAIGNET's protest (with which the book begins) against the abandonment, in the French Lycées and Colleges, of Rhetoric, *i.e.* of the study of the principles of eloquence, poetry, and other literature, for the mere historical *résumé* of practical results or products of an art, is entirely out of accord with the dominant note of our present practical age and especially of our modern educational systems and text-books, the main object of which, at least in literature, seems to be to discourage independent thought and observation as a training of the mind, and to substitute instead facilities for storing up ready-made the thoughts of others and those useful facts and rote-lessons which appear most likely to secure the main object of early life, success in examinations.

Still books like the above may after all be welcome to the few who believe that there are phenomena in literature quite as interesting as in natural science, and deserving just the same sort of scientific observation and analysis as that study: and even those who think that Rhetoric is dead may perhaps be inclined to read an obituary account of a system which was developed by the greatest of philosophers and helped to produce some of the grandest literature of ancient times and some of the best orators not only of Greece and Rome but of France and England.

The preface is good and interesting and one may add characteristic; certainly the note on p. xiii. (in which M. Sainte-Beuve's 'naturalist' method of studying literary phenomena by tracing them back to inherited maternal influences is touched on,

and his omission of all reference to the father explained *par les difficultés de la recherche de la paternité*) is more French than English. The next part is a history of Rhetoric in 66 pages, very readable, if not original, tracing the early development of the terms and divisions familiar to the student of Cicero and Quintilian. Then follows the main work, which is an attempt, suggested by Fénelon, to weave into one work the best rules and observations of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian and others.

Part I is devoted to a general survey of the subject and to the usual definitions of Rhetoric and its distinctive divisions. Part II. (*Inventio*) reproduces in nearly all its details and mostly in the same order the main subjects of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, Books I. and II., illustrated of course from other works of Aristotle and from Cicero and Quintilian, as well as a large extract from the *Politics* on the theory of governments—in all about 250 pp. Part III. discusses the structure and the five (or six) divisions of the speech at much less length, in 65 pp., of which, strangely, three pages only are given to the peroration. Part IV. finishes the work, with about 130 pp. on style, tropes, and figures. These two last parts naturally reproduce Cicero and Quintilian more than Aristotle.

The work as a whole is somewhat diffuse and popular, yet not free from a good many of those technical importations from later rhetoricians which eventually ruined Rhetoric as an art. At the same time it is very much more readable than Volkmann's useful summary (*Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer*) The last part is the best. The illustrations from Bossuet brighten the subject, and it is a pity that more in this way has not been done

in the earlier parts. There are some interesting remarks on the distinctive features of tropes and figures of words and on the comparison of the different styles to those of statuary and architecture. It is curious that the author does not see, or deliberately discards, the analogy to be found, in architecture at least, as also in music perhaps and other arts, to the gradual development of Oratory, after its first rough stage, from simplicity and chasteness into the decorated and almost geometrical style, thence to excess and confusion of ornament, and thence to a mixture of styles.

Here and there are many suggestive remarks, though perhaps there was not much scope for originality, and most of the book ought to be interesting and intelligible even to those who have not studied Aristotle and Quintilian, and especially useful to those who have begun the study of Rhetoric.

There are traces of inaccuracy in the matter of scholarship. Part I. unfortunately

opens with the following motto, *La parole est l'emploi le plus propre que l'homme fasse de son corps*, as a translation of Arist. *Rhet.* I. 1, λόγος ὁ μᾶλλον ἰδίον ἐστὶ ἀνθρώπου τῆς τοῦ σώματος χρείας. Other traces may be found in both notes on p. 75; on p. 93 ψυχαγωγία translated as 'possession' passively; p. 79 περὶ τὸν λόγον as *par la parole*; and τὴν διάνοιαν as 'thoughts' instead of the thought-matter (the whole paraphrase in the note is weak). A similar carelessness about the article in Greek may be seen in the rendering of αὐτοῦ τοῦ θηρίου on p. 100. These however are unimportant details, not affecting the main subject of a book, which may be welcomed as another useful contribution from France to a study that she of all nations ought to be ashamed of giving up just at a time when, if properly connected with psychology and even physiology, it may become again most popular and useful.

J. E. NIXON.

GREEK VERSIFICATION IN INSCRIPTIONS.

On Greek Versification in Inscriptions, by FREDERIC D. ALLEN. Reprinted from the Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Vol IV., published by Damrell and Upham, Boston, 1888.

THIS work supplies a long felt want. The writer of this notice had occasion fifteen years ago to seek testimony of the inscriptions to support a theory of the nature of elision (the very theory which a study of the inscriptions has led Prof. Allen to adopt), and after much toil was able only to say in general terms that his theory was not without epigraphic support; whereas this work gives numerous examples of the needed phenomena. The work of Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus collecta* (1878) had, of course, in the mean time very much facilitated the use of inscriptions in metrical investigations: but in Prof. Allen's work (which is based upon the material furnished by Kaibel, with many additional inscriptions) the whole ground is carefully surveyed, the material classified and arranged, and the results presented and illustrated, all of which is so exhaustively done that the metrical investigator will find the answer to any question he may desire to ask.

In the compass of a brief notice, it will not be possible to give more than a general outline of the contents.

In the Introductory Remarks (4 pp.) a brief account is presented of the extent and nature of the material. Illustrations of clumsy verses are given, and the causes of the faults are discussed.

Then follows in chapter I (4 pp.) a chronological classification, with remarks on certain peculiarities, such as departures from the strict alternation of hexameters and pentameters in elegiacs, the introduction of iambic verses, etc.

In the next chapter (II, 2 pp.), on 'Unmetrical Verses,' are enumerated 'hexameters' with too many feet, interpolated verses, and unmetrical hexameters, pentameters, and iambic trimeters.

In chapter III (16 pp.), on the 'Structure of the Hexameter,' are treated: A. Caesuras. 1. Caesura of the third foot. In centuries 6-5 B.C. the ratio of the masculine to the feminine caesura was 100 : 109; in centuries 4-2 the ratio was 100 : 58. A comparison is made between this remarkable result and the statistics of the poets from Homer to Nicander. 2. Bucolic caesura: full statistics, illustrated with examples. 3. Trochaic caesura of the fourth foot,

This is by no means so rare, relatively, as in the poets. 4. Caesura after the third foot. 5. Other caesuras. B. Dactyls and spondees, their relations to each other in all the feet of hexameters.

In chapter IV (2 pp.) the structure of the pentameter, and in V (4 pp.) that of other verses, is discussed.

In chapter VI (10 pp.) are many interesting observations on the quantity of vowels. The υ of $\acute{\upsilon}\acute{o}\varsigma$ is shown to have been long, and the author considers it an error when Meisterhans (1st ed., p. 28, n. 247) makes υ short in $\kappa\alpha\epsilon\alpha\gamma\acute{\upsilon}\alpha$ ($\kappa\alpha\epsilon\alpha\gamma\acute{\upsilon}\alpha$). It may be remarked that Meisterhans, in his 2nd ed., p. 46, n. 408, still writes $\kappa\alpha\epsilon\alpha\gamma\acute{\upsilon}\alpha$, $\kappa\alpha\epsilon\alpha\gamma\acute{\upsilon}\alpha$.

In chapter VII (20 pp.) are found some interesting facts about quantity by position. Elaborate tables, illustrating the various combinations, are given. In chapter VIII (6 pp.) contraction and synizesis, in chapter IX (2 pp.) hiatus, and in X (17 pp.) the shortening of vowels before vowels are treated in the same manner. This latter subject is fully illustrated and elaborately

discussed. In chapter XI (2 pp.), on 'Crisis,' written and unwritten, all the examples are quoted; in XII (31 pp.) the subject of elision is treated exhaustively, and in XIII (1 p.) aphaeresis is examined. The examples of aphaeresis are exceedingly rare, only one clear case being found, and in it the vowel is written. Chapter XIV (3 pp.) treats of N movable. The Appendix (43 pp.) contains a list of the inscriptions used: A. Kaibel's inscriptions. B. Inscriptions not in Kaibel's collections (full text).

The value of a work like this depends much upon the accuracy and intelligence with which the observations have been made. That this work is in this regard trustworthy, we can fortunately feel assured, for the ability and fidelity of the author are well known: independently of this, the examples cited of each phenomenon are so full that the reader can for himself verify the conclusions.

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

University of Virginia.

A CLASSICAL NOVEL.

Masters of the World. By MARY A. M. HOPPUS (MRS. MARKS). 3 vols. London. Bentley. 1889. 31s. 6d.

THIS is an ambitious and, it may be said, successful attempt to reproduce Roman life under the Empire. Whether the Romans felt and talked as they feel and talk in Mrs. Marks's novel is more than any critic can say. But her men and women are at least human, and they interest us. And further, the accessories of the picture are, on the whole, correct. The hero of the story is a certain Calpurnius Piso. The Pisos, it was said, were always very good or very bad, and our Piso is a very favourable specimen of the better class. But he has fallen upon evil times. The reign of terror which concluded the principate of Domitian, the time during which 'continuo et velut uno ictu rempublicam exhausit' has begun; and this man of noble birth and primitive virtue, a hundredfold more fit to reign than the wretch who sat upon the throne, is manifestly doomed. He is, we suppose, not historical, but he may be said to be the Piso Licinianus, who for a few days shared the Imperial power with Galba,

put some quarter of a century late. Mrs. Marks has drawn a noble figure, who well represents the virtues and, perhaps I may add, the incapacity for power of the class to which he belonged. This is, I think, the most genuinely historical effect in the book. The figure of the Emperor himself was easier to draw, especially for an artist who did not feel the need of putting any light and shade into her picture. It is difficult, indeed, to see where the light comes into the character of the last of the Flavian princes. One cannot blame Mrs. Marks if she confines herself to describing his person, made visible to us by vivid touches from contemporary pens, his brutal humour, his suspicious rage, and all the sinister characteristics of the 'bald-headed Nero.' If Domitian is the villain on the throne, Calpurnius Crassus is the villain among subjects. But the outlines of his character are not sufficiently firm or distinct, and we seem to know much less of him than we do either of Piso or the Emperor. On the other hand, there is some admirable work in the three women, grandmother, mother and daughter. Cornelia, the eldest, is, perhaps, the only one that is distinctively Roman, but

we can fancy that we meet the others in the letters of Pliny; the matron Aemilia may have been such another as Pliny's own Calpurnia, and the charming Calpurnia as the daughter of Fundanus (Epp. v. 6), only not cut off in her youth. I must not forget to mention the pathetic little figure of Tertia, sadly frightened, poor child, as she lies dying, of the horrible dog Cerberus and other ghastly creatures of the nether world. Silius Italicus, Arulenus Rusticus and Mauricus, Regulus, whom even the good-natured Pliny could not endure, and not a few other historical personages figure in these pages. Pliny himself and Tacitus are only spoken of, though both were probably in Rome during the action of the story. Pliny was praetor in 93, when the tale opens, and though, as he tells us, he halted in his course of honours at this stage, he seems to have remained in the capital, while Tacitus certainly speaks of himself as an eyewitness of the horrors of Domitian's last years, we might almost say as involved by his presence in something of their guilt.

The story has been carefully worked out, and errors are not frequent. The Emperor is represented as absent from Italy in October 93. Was this so? Antonius Saturninus revolted in the beginning of this year, and Domitian set out with the intention of conducting the campaign in person. But the revolt was crushed at once, Antonius's German allies being prevented from crossing the Rhine by the breaking up of the ice

(ipsa dimicationis hora resolutus repente Rhenus), and Domitian, who had left Rome with reluctance, so much did he fear conspiracies in his absence, probably returned at once. Silius is spoken of as having been 'three times Consul,' but Martial's 'tertius consul' means that he was one of three consuls in his family. Curiously enough his name does not appear in the *Fasti*, though he certainly filled the office, as we know from the picturesque description of the attempted abdication of Vitellius. Mrs. Marks's names do not seem always right. A Calpurnius could hardly have had a son named Julius, as the lad had certainly not been adopted into the *Julia Gens*. *Cyathus* means a ladle not a cup.

'Two cups, two double cups, Callistus mine,
Fill high, fill high, with good Falernian wine.'

does not properly represent 'Sextantes, Calliste, duos infunde Falerni.' The poet asks for four *cyathi* to be put into his cup. The Roman capacity for drink was enormous, but it becomes miraculous if we suppose that the *cyathi* were cups. Martial's draught was merely a small tumblerful (about a third of a pint). Lower down we read 'Fill ten cups for Domitianus.' Why not say 'found guilty of treason' rather than 'found guilty of *maiestas*'? The elliptical use of the word makes its employment in this way very awkward.

ALFRED CHURCH.

Paulus Rawack: de Platonis Timaeo quaestiones criticae. Berlin, Mayer and Müller, 1888. 8vo. pp. 81. 2 Mk.

THIS book contains a critical examination of the text of several passages of the *Timaeus* and an appendix of 'testimonia veterum,' which, the author contends, may be turned to better account than has hitherto been done for the criticism of the dialogue. The short introduction is chiefly concerned with the amount of reliance to be placed on the 'lemmata' of Proclus, which, it is decided, ought not 'temere omni auctoritate privari,' although indisputably showing many corruptions. Herr Rawack then proceeds to examine the following passages.

(i) 17 C. The doubtful words in Par. A *καὶ ἀφ' ἐκαστου τῆς τέχνης (τὴν τέχνην Hermann)* are with Hermann and Böckh to be expunged: this is confirmed both by the lemma and the commentary of Proclus.

(ii) 19 A. For *ἐφαμεν* read *φαμεν* with the lemma of Proclus. This point is discussed at a length seemingly quite disproportionate to its minuteness: Rawack's intention is however to defend *φαμεν* in some other Platonic passages against the doubts of Badham and Hermann.

(iii) 21 E. For *περὶ ὃ* read with Proclus *περὶ ὧν*, referring to *νομοί*.

(iv) 22 C. Before *κατ' οὐρανόν* omit *καί*, which Proclus has neither in lemma nor in commentary.

(v) 30 B. The author argues (but not, I think, very convincingly) in favour of omitting *τε* after *ἐννοῦν*, and is doubtful as to the genuineness of *ἐμύσυχον*.

(vi) 41 A. He has a long discussion of the opening words of the *δημιουργοῦ δημιουργοῦ*. His main points are these: first *θεοὶ θεῶν* is equivalent to 'dii summi': which, as I think, is indubitably right. Next the difficulty of the sequel is to be met by discarding (on the proposal of Bernays) the words *ἀδὲ μοῦ γενόμενα*, so that the whole will run *ὧν ἐγὼ δημιουργὸς πατὴρ τε ἔργων* (i.e. *ἔργα ὧν ἐγὼ δημιουργὸς πατὴρ τε*) *ἔλυτα* κ.τ.λ. Thirdly the rejection of *μὴ* before *ἐθέλοντος* is advocated. The whole sentence is thus converted from an appellation into a statement. Notwithstanding the simplification thus attained—and certainly Rawack's correction is far preferable to Badham's—I doubt whether ears once familiarised with the received text will readily reconcile themselves to the amended version.

(vii) 80 E. For *περὶ αὐτὸ* read *περὶ αὐτὰ*. In the words immediately following, *τῆς τοῦ πυρός... φύσις*,

the received reading is vindicated. Finally we are to follow Wachsmuth in altering the punctuation, starting a fresh sentence at *ἔθεν τοῦ κατὰ*, and expunging the full stop after *διεληλύθαμεν*.

(viii) 27 B. *σὺν οὖν ἔργον λέγειν ἂν, ὃ τίμαιε, εἴη τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐπικαλέσαντα κατὰ νόμον θεοῦ*. So Hermann. *ἐπικαλέσαντα* is the reading of A, which omits *εἴη*: the other MSS. give *καλέσαντα*, and some of them place *εἴη* just before, some just after *ὃ τίμαιε*. Rawack makes out a good case for *λέγειν ἂν, ὃ τίμαιε, τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο, ὡς ἔοικεν, εἴη καλέσαντα*.

(ix) 40 C. Rawack's suggestions in this difficult sentence are as follows. (1) In *καὶ περὶ τὰς τῶν κύκλων πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ἐπανακυρήσεις*, he applauds 'Dielesii egregiam coniecturam' *πρὸς* (adverbial) for *περὶ*. But surely the ambiguity and cacophony of this can hardly be endured. (2) *προσχωρήσεις* should be *προχωρήσεις*. (3) for *ὅποιοι τῶν θεῶν* read *ὅποιοι τῶν θεῶν*—a clear improvement. (4) The words *μεθ' οὐστυνας...πέμπουσι* are 'explicanda magis quam emendanda.' Rawack takes *ἀλλήλοις ἡμῖν τε* together.

(x) 33 A. *προσπίπτοντα ἀκαίρως λυεῖ*. For *λυεῖ* read *λυεῖ*: but the argument is not convincing.

(xi) 33 D. Read *ἐντιθεῖς*, not *ἐνθεῖς*.

(xii) 41 E. *ὄργανα χρόνου* is rightly defended against *χρόνων*.

(xiii) 66 A. For *πάντα τοιαῦτα* read *πάντα ταῦτα* or *πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα*.

(xiv) 70 D. *ὅσον ἔνδειαν* is maintained against Hermann's *ὅσον*.

(xv) 86 C. *κακῶς* is to be rejected before *δοξάζεται*. Next follows the appendix of 'testimonia,' pp. 40-81.

Herr Rawack makes effective use of his Proclus, and his criticism is sober and scholarly: some of his corrections will, if I mistake not, be adopted by future editors.

R. D. ARCHER-HIND.

The Republic of Plato: Book X. By B. D. TURNER, M.A. 4s. 6d.

THE tenth book of the *Republic* is a little unmeaning when taken by itself, and when Mr. Turner pleads as the justification for a separate edition of it the theory that it formed no part of the original scheme but was 'a pendent or supplement,' the answer is obvious that supplements are usually very incomplete without that which they supplement, though it may be tolerably complete without them. For a school-book the earlier parts of the *Republic* are certainly better, and if any one above the years of a schoolboy is beginning the study of Plato's philosophy it would hardly be worth his while to begin with the last book. Mr. Turner's notes, which deal mainly with the Greek, though other things are not neglected, seem to be fairly full and accurate. A good deal of attention is given to grammatical matters and they are usually treated with good knowledge and judgment. In the words *τὸ δὲ νῦν μοι περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰπέ* (604 A), where Mr. Turner justifies the use of *τὸ* as a demonstrative, he seems hardly to see the difficulties in the way of taking it so here, the chief of which is perhaps the fact that, when so used in Attic, it always (I think) points to something preceding, not following. Is there any example of such a use as this would be? When he remarks on *οὐδ' ἂν ἤξει* (615 D) that 'the future indicative with *ἂν* is a rare but undoubted usage in Attic Greek,' Mr. Turner can hardly mean by 'undoubted' more than that he thinks we ought not to doubt it, for he must be well aware that there have been and are great doubts on the subject. In his note on *καὶ τοῦτο προστήσασθαι τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ βίου ὡς βέλτιστον ἔχοντα*

(599 A) he translates the verb by 'put this forward as the aim' and then explains it as '=*sibi proponere*,' which seems another thing. Surely the translation is the more correct of the two and the word means 'make it the profession of his life' in the strict sense of the word 'profession.' The statement on 599 C that 'ei when interrogative is followed by *οὐδ'*' seems too brief and unqualified a canon. He regards the obscure words in 615 C *τῶν δὲ εὐθὺς γενομένων καὶ ὀλίγον χρόνον βιούντων* as probably right and does not mention the conjecture of Cobet, *ἀπο-γενομένων*, which had occurred to me independently. If it or anything like it were right, the two participles would of course refer to two distinct sets of children.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

Xenophon, Oeconomicus. H. A. HOLDEN. Fourth Edition. 1889. 6s.

DR. HOLDEN is to be heartily congratulated on the fact that his excellent and scholarly commentary on Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, which first appeared in 1884, has so soon reached its fourth edition—the best possible proof of its usefulness and merit as a school book. On the whole the editor has made but little change in the present edition: he has 'adopted one or two emendations in the text, and introduced a considerable number of corrections and additions in the notes and lexicon.' Most of these alterations however are relegated to an Addenda and Corrigenda of some thirteen pages, and for their suggestion Dr. Holden acknowledges himself chiefly indebted to two recent works on Xenophon, the one Dr. J. J. Hartmann's *Analecta Xenophontea*, the other a small edition of the *Oeconomicus* by M. A. Jacob, on both of which he bestows high praise. Dr. Holden's own work has now reached the somewhat unwieldy size of 440 pages of introduction, notes explanatory and critical, and lexicon compared with 84 pages of text. Surely therefore in a future edition we may look for very considerable compression in the notes, as the *Oeconomicus* is a dialogue which, however elegant and interesting as illustrative of Greek agricultural and social life, is after all somewhat limited in its scope.

G. E. UNDERHILL.

Caesar's Army, by HENRY P. JUDSON, University of Minnesota. Ginn & Co. Boston, 1888. 3s. 6d.

MR. JUDSON's little book consists of 125 pages, of which 17 are occupied by maps. It is on the whole a useful piece of work, though not containing much original matter: but the straightforward way in which borrowings are acknowledged almost atones for their frequency.

Mr. Judson divides his book into three main heads, the organization, tactics, and equipment of the army of Caesar. His other sections, on Caesar's fleet and Caesar's enemies, are too short and sketchy to require notice.

The chapter on the organization of the Roman army in the last years of the Republic contains plenty of solid information, but passes over a great many disputed points without any allusion to their uncertainty. For example Mr. Judson simply says in regard to the numbering of the legions that "Roman legions were designated by numbers, probably according to priority in formation." This completely omits the two tiresome facts that on the one hand Caesar had legions (e.g. the *legio Martia*) which seem to have had no numbers, while on the other duplicate numbers appear, owing to each emperor taking account of his own troops only, e.g.

Antony and Octavian and Lepidus had each a *legio* I, II, and so forth.

So again, as to the effective strength of a Roman legion, Mr. Judson observes that "Ritstow estimates the average force of a legion throughout Caesar's campaigns at from 3,000 to 3,600 men. Göler puts it at 4,800, besides 300 *antesignani*. These estimates cannot be far from the truth." He seems to regard 3,000 and 5,100 as numbers so close together that they can be practically looked upon as one. As a matter of fact they represent two such different methods of reckoning, that choice must be made between them. No one ever supposed that a legion consisted of 10,000 or 2,000 men.

Another point in which Mr. Judson seems to go astray is his use of the phrase 'tactical unit.' He defines it very rightly as 'a body of troops by the combination of several of which a higher unit is formed.' But he then proceeds to use it not only for the component parts but for the ultimate whole. For example, he speaks of the Roman legion and the modern corps as 'tactical units,' whereas they are the highest organizations complete in themselves, and not divisions of any larger body.

Of the difficult question concerning the relative rank of the centurions in a legion we have a very fair statement in pages 10-12, but no definite conclusion is arrived at. For our own part we cannot help thinking that the difficulty merely rests on a loose use of the word *ordo*. We hear of centurions '*primorum ordinum*' who are almost certainly the '*pili priores*' of the ten cohorts. There being six centurions per cohort, we should have six '*ordines*' of them. Yet an officer promoted for bravery is said to be raised '*ab octavis ordinibus*' to the command of the first cohort of the legion. These would seem to imply that there must have been eight *ordines*, but we think that the words must be taken to mean merely the eighth place in the legion, *i.e.* the position of *octavus pilus prior*. The natural order of promotion would have been from that rank to

septimus pilus prior, the first place in the seventh cohort, but Caesar sent up his *protégé* over the heads of six of his seniors.

The tactical chapters in Mr. Judson's book seem to give much less opportunity for criticism than those on organization. We should doubt his account of the British chariot tactics, which seem too complicated for practical use, nor is it quite fair to say that "the heavy infantry furnished by the allies (*auxilia*) in a Roman army were rather used to make a show of force, than for much important service in battle." But the general drift of the chapters is good, and we notice several apposite comparisons drawn from modern warfare, *e.g.* that of the average fight between a Roman cohort and a Gallic phalanx to the well-known struggle between the 7th Fusiliers, in line, and the two Kazan battalions, in column, at the battle of the Alma.

The maps at the end of the volume seem to be taken from Napoleon III.'s *Life of Julius Caesar*, and require no original criticism. The engravings of military subjects are, as is unavoidable, mainly drawn from works of art executed during the Empire, and cannot therefore be implicitly relied upon as showing the dress or armament of the Republican times.

C. OMAN.

Grammatik der Lateinische Sprache, Bearbeitet von Dr. H. SCHWEIZER-SIDLER, und Dr. ALFRED SURBER. Erster Theil. Halle, 1888. This little book (of only 215 pages) is a new recension of Schweizer-Sidler's Latin *Elementar und Formenlehre* published in 1869. The importance of the present volume is that its writers have entirely recast their theory of Latin morphology in accordance with the procedure of the new school of Comparative Philology. It is much to be hoped that some competent English or American scholar will either translate the book into English, or write an original work of the same character.

H. N.

NOTES.

PERSIUS III. 43.—Mr. Housman is known as a bold and skilful surgeon—not one to 'croon charms over wounds that need the knife.' But this is not a passage for trenchant handling. After quoting Conington, whose translation 'the ghastly inward paleness, which is a mystery, even to the wife of the bosom' is naturally open to an attack from the side of literal common sense, he says, 'I can imagine no worse nonsense than *inward paleness*. What is paleness? It is one among the outward symptoms of inward disorder, nowhere else in the frame of a living man. When a man is dissected then his inward parts may have this colour or that: till then they have none at all.' No doubt Mr. Housman is strictly within his rights to refuse all colour to a man's inward parts until he is dissected; but can he 'imagine no worse nonsense' than the 'lily-livered' of Shakespeare or the 'white-livered' of the common parlance? Are we to be allowed no *μεταφορά*—no transference of the outward sign to the inner seat of emotion? This transference of the external manifestations of a feeling to its internal origin is turned to good effect by Persius here. There is the outward sign of fear or guilty consciousness—the pallid face; but worse than that is the inward paleness which dares not betray itself by any outward manifestation. Confusions of

NO. XXV. VOL. III.

the literal and metaphorical are almost too common to need illustration. I have quoted on p. lxxii. of the Introduction to my *Selections from Propertius* several examples. One I may cite here, Ovid *E. P.* 2, 5, 38, 'sed sunt tua pectora lacte et non calcata candidiora niue.' Here Mr. Housman is bound by his own argument to take the reference to be to the outward fairness of the breast, not its inward fairness (or candour) of which alone Ovid is thinking. In spite of all strivings after an etymological explanation, *λευκαῖς πύθσσαντα φρασί*, Pind. *P.* 4, 109, I think still refers to Pelias' mind 'disordered' by the passions which bring pallor to the cheek. Mr. Housman and I are agreed about the construction, though I venture to doubt whether I. 124, *Eupolidem pallere*, 'to have Eupolis on the cheeks,' altogether justifies *ulcus pallore*: but emendation I think I have shown is not needed.

J. P. POSTGATE.

* * *

S. JAMES IV. 2.—*ἐπιθυμεῖτε καὶ οὐκ ἔχετε φανεύετε καὶ ζηλοῦτε, καὶ οὐ δύνασθε ἐπιτυχεῖν μάχεσθε καὶ πολεμεῖτε*. This is the reading and punctuation of Westcott and Hort, agreeing in essentials with Alford, Tischendorf and the more recent editors. The R.V.

T

has 'ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and covet (marg. 'are jealous'), and cannot obtain: ye fight and war.' The extraordinary anti-climax 'ye kill and covet' has long exercised the minds of commentators, who have endeavoured to remove it either (1) by weakening the force of *φονεύετε*, or (2) by strengthening the force of *ζηλοῦτε*, or (3) by giving a special meaning to the connexion between them, or (4) by changing the reading.

(1, *a.*) 'Kill' means 'hate,' because every one that hateth his brother is a murderer. So Estius, Corn. a Lap., Theile, De Wette, Wiesinger, Beyschlag, Erdmann. (1, *b.*) 'Kill' means 'commit moral suicide,' so Eusebius and Theophylact, *φονεύειν φησὶ τοὺς τὴν ἐαυτῶν ψυχὴν ἀποκτινύνοντας ταῖς τοιαύταις ἐπιχειρήσεσι*.

(2) *ζηλοῦτε* means 'become *ζηλωταί*,' i.e. assassins; so Dean Scott in the *Speaker's Commentary*, referring to Josephus, *B.J.* vii. 8, 1, where the *ζηλωταί* are said to have been worse than the *σικαριοί*.

(3) *φονεύετε καὶ ζηλοῦτε* form a hendiadys, 'ye murderously envy,' *ad nocem usque invidetis*. So Pott, Schneckenburger, Gebser, and not much otherwise Bengel, *occiditis per odia et zelum*.

(4) Erasmus, followed by Calvin, Beza, Hottinger, Ewald, reads *φθονεῖτε*, supposing this to have been carelessly written *φονεῖτε*, (which indeed we find in Eusebius) and corrected into *φονεύετε*.

The objections to these expedients are to my mind conclusive. (1) It does not follow, because to show the heinousness of hate it may be represented as virtually equivalent to the murder of which it is the germ, that it is therefore allowable in all cases to substitute the word 'murder' for the word 'hate.' In the present case it may be safely said that no sane writer, no one who had the slightest feeling for rhetorical effect (and St. James is both eminently sane and eminently rhetorical) could have used *φονεύετε* in the sense of *μισεῖτε* before *ζηλοῦτε*. There is no reason here to lay an exaggerated stress on the idea of hate, if nothing more than hate is intended: not only does it make a mere bathos of *ζηλοῦτε*, but it weakens the force of the following *μάχεσθε καὶ πολεμεῖτε*. Of (2) it is sufficient to say that there is no evidence of the verb *ζηλόω* being used in this sense, and nothing to suggest it in the G.T. use of the word *ζηλωτῆς*. (3) If *ζηλοῦτε* preceded *φονεῖτε*, something might be said for the theory of *ἐν διὰ δύοιν*, but as it is, every one must feel that it is a suggestion of despair. (4) At first sight there is something attractive in the reading *φθονεῖτε*, but as I shall endeavour to show in a moment, there is no occasion for the change, and emendation is only defensible where it is necessary.

Lastly, Alford, Bouman, Schegg and others, feeling the unsatisfactory nature of the above mentioned explanations, have fallen back on the literal rendering. Schegg is the only commentator known to me who makes any attempt to account for the order of the

words, which he defends as follows. 'Die Lust begehret, d. h. sie sucht werthtätig zu erreichen, wornach sie gelüstet; die Lust tölet, d. h. sie schafft gewaltsam bei seite was ihr hinderlich entgegentritt; die Lust ringet um das, was sie zu erlangen im Begriffe ist... Da töten und ringen verschiedene Objecte haben, indem sich töten gegen, ringen auf etwas richtet, so hat Jakobus psychologisch richtig die Reihen- und Stufenfolge der Aeusserungen des Gelüstens eingehalten.' It is by no means certain that *ζηλοῦτε* is to be taken here in the sense, which Schegg assigns to it, of striving after a thing: it is often followed by an accusative of the person. But supposing it to be true that the object of *ζηλοῦτε* is here a thing, and that of *φονεύετε* a person, I am unable to see why this makes it psychologically right to put *φονεῖτε* first. Surely it is the resistance to our effort to gain an object which suggests to us the necessity of moving the obstacle out of the way.

I have for many years held the opinion that the true interpretation of this passage is obtained by an alteration in the punctuation, placing a colon after *φονεῖτε*; and I am glad to find that the same idea had occurred to Dr. J. Chr. K. v. Hofmann, whose commentary appeared in 1876. It is also given as an alternative reading in Westcott and Hort's edition (1881). The easiest way of seeing how the words naturally group themselves is to put them side by side without any stopping. 'Ye lust and have not ye kill and covet and cannot obtain ye fight and war.' Can any one doubt that the abrupt collocations 'ye kill,' 'ye fight,' are employed to express results of what precedes, and that in the second series 'covet and cannot obtain' correspond to 'lust and have not' in the first series? Unsatisfied desire leads to murder (as in the case of Naboth); disappointed ambition leads to quarrelling and fighting. If we adopt the reading of Erasmus we shall have only the last result, 'ye fight and war,' following the two antecedents, 'ye lust and have not,' 'ye are envious and jealous and cannot obtain.' Though Hofmann is, as I believe, right in his punctuation, yet I agree with Schegg in thinking his interpretation of *φονεῖτε* mistaken. I see no objection to understanding it of real murder, as we have in ch. 5, 6 *ἐφονεύσατε τὸν δίκαιον*. Hofmann, on the contrary, takes it of virtual murder: 'wer begehrt und nicht hat, der bringt den Andern um das, was er zum Leben braucht, um das zu haben, wornach er begehrt.' Schegg and Beyschlag and Erdmann also object to his grouping of the words as harsh and unlike the style of St. James, but the only difficulty which is introduced by it is that the second series (*ζηλοῦτε καὶ τ.λ.*) is joined to the first by *καὶ* instead of standing independently by its side. May we not consider this sufficiently accounted for by the fact that the figure asyndeton was already employed to mark the change from the antecedents to the consequents?

J. B. M.

TRANSACTIONS OF CAMBRIDGE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

At a Meeting of the CAMBRIDGE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY, held on Thursday, May 2, Mr. Bayfield read a paper on Conditional and Indefinite Sentences in Greek. The positions taken up were briefly as follows:—

1. It is not true that in such a sentence as *εἰ τοῦτο ἐποίησεν, ἤδικοι ἄν* (whether referring to present or past time) non-fulfilment of the condition is necessarily

implied: cp. Eur. *Ion.*, 354, *σοὶ ταῦτ' ὅν ἔβησεν, εἴπερ ἦν, εἰχ' ἄν μέτρον*. So far from believing the child to be dead, Kreousa has come to Delphi expressly to learn whether it is dead or not. Whenever it is evident that the condition is not fulfilled, this is so in consequence of knowledge possessed independently by the hearer or reader.

2. The so-called 'general' conditional sentences

(*ἴδν ποτε* λοιδορηθῶσι, ἀεὶ γελῶμεν) are rather Indefinite Temporal Sentences, and should be classed as such (*ἴδν ποτε* = *trash*).

3. The title 'Indefinite' should be limited to sentences whose *time* is indefinite. Thus *ὅποι ποτὲ ἡγείται*, 'whithersoever he is now leading,' is an ordinary relative sentence; *ὅποι ποτ' ἂν ἡγήται*, 'whithersoever he may at any time lead' (or 'shall lead') would be an 'indefinite' sentence. In classical Greek *ὅς ἂν* never refers to definite time; e.g. *ὅς ἂν ᾄδῃ* could not mean 'whoever is singing now.' The difference between *ὅς* and *ὅς ἂν* is not that between *who* and *whoever*, but that between *who* and *who ever*, i.e. at any time.

4. In such a sentence as

ἔχθρὸς γάρ μοι κείνος ὁμῶς 'Αἰδαο πύλῃσιν
γίγνεται, ὅς πενήν' εἴκων ἀπατήλια βάσει
(*Od.* 14. 156),

the clause *ὅς...βάσει* is purely descriptive; the time-

notion is lost and *κείνος ὅς βάσει* is felt to be equivalent to *ὁ βάσων*. Cp. 'who steals my purse, steals trash.'

Dr. Postgate read a short paper on the Latin Future Infinitive in *-urum*. After referring to his paper, read before the Philological Society, London, in April, 1887 (published in abstract in its *Proceedings*, p. xvii.), in which he showed that the declinable forms *-urum*, *-uram*, *-urum*, etc., were descended from the indeclinable Fut. Inf. vouched for in early Latin, e.g. by Gellius *Noct.* i. 7, and pointing out the objections which there were to considering it the neuter of the participle in *-urus*, he proposed to explain it as a compound of the dat. of the verbal stem *-tu* and an infinitive from *√es* 'be' **er-um*, parallel to the Oscan *ezom* and Umbr. *crom*, the rhotacism of which seems to be rightly explained by Mr. Conway, *Verner's Law in Italy*, p. 33, as due to their being enclitic forms. Thus *uenturum* = *uentū (e)rum* 'to be for coming.'

FROM TENNYSON'S 'ANCIENT SAGE.'

THE years that when my youth began
Had set the lily and rose
By all my ways where'er they ran,
Have ended mortal foes;
My rose of love for ever gone,
My lily of truth and trust—
They made her lily and rose in one,
And changed her into dust.
O rose-tree planted in my grief,
And growing, on her tomb,
Her dust is green in your leaf,
Her blood is in your bloom.
O slender lily waving there,
And laughing back the light,
In vain you tell me 'Earth is fair'
When all is dark as night.
But vain the tears for darkened years,
As laughter over wine,
And vain the laughter as the tears,
O brother, mine or thine.
For all that laugh and all that weep
And all that breathe are one
Slight ripple on the boundless deep
That moves, and all is gone.
Yet wine and laughter, friends! and set
The lamps alight, and call
For golden music, and forget
The darkness of the pall.
O worms and maggots of to-day
Without their hope of wings!
Tho' some have gleams, or so they say,
Of more than mortal things.
And idle gleams will come and go,
But still the clouds remain;
And Night and Shadow rule below,
When only Day should reign.

IDEM LATINE REDDITUM.

ANNI, qui mihi lilia,
qui fudere rosas callibus adsitas,
quas pressi tenero pede,
tristes jam rigida fronte gerunt minas.
me ditavit amor rosa
adjecitque fides integra liliū;
at quae lilia cum rosis
miscens una dedit, pulvis iners jacet.
O flos, quem tumulo dolens
adsevi, cineres illius illius
vernant fronde tua, rubent
intacto melius germina sanguine.
O risu quod amabili
reddis dulce jubar, mobile liliū,
me caligine nox premit,
frustra qualis agri gratia sit mones.
vanos pocula dant jocos,
vanas tempora dant tristitia lacrimas;
seu tu, sive ego fleverim,
nil, O Grophe, valet lacrima, nil jocus.
huic risus datur, huic dolor,
at quotquot vegeto lumine vescimur,
ceu magno levis in mari
quae nunc unda tumet, nunc abiit, sumus.
at vinum date cum jocis,
addat viva faces taeda sodalibus,
praesto sit melos aureum,
quod nigras abigat noctis imagines.
vermes vivimus in diem,
queis alam voluerem sors fore denegat,
ut sint quorum oculis jubar
incertum superas obtulerit domos.
fallax it jubar et redit,
nubes usque polo se glomerant, humum
nox umbra tegit horrida,
quae lucere novo debuerat die.

E. D. S.

OBITUARY.

DR. KENNEDY.

II.

'The Honour Boards of Shrewsbury School, 1806-1882' (Shrewsbury, Adnitt and Naunton, 1882), are the most eloquent testimony to the three successive headmasters who for now nearly a century have ruled the school of Sir Philip Sidney.

Dr. Butler's most eminent pupils were (1) at Cambridge, Thomas Smart Hughes, Robert Wilson Evans, Marmaduke Lawson, Edward Baines, John Price ('Old Price'), John Hodgson, F. E. Gretton, the Hildyards and Kennedys; Charles Whitley senior wrangler; R. Shilleto who was Kennedy's private pupil; C. R. Darwin, E. Warter, G. F. Harris, John Cooper, G. H. Marsh, W. H. Bateson, W. G. Humphry, A. J. Ellis the philologist, G. A. C. May, Henry Thompson, F. A. Paley, T. S. Evans, A. M. Hopper, Francis France, H. A. Marsh; (2) at Oxford, George H. Johnson, Edward Massie (who seems to have been the first to turn into Latin elegiacs the famous gas circular), Charles Borrett, John Thomas, P. S. Payne, Robert Scott the lexicographer, Thomas Brancker, (elected Ireland University Scholar while a sixth form boy), Henry Holden (one of the editors of *Sabrinæ Corolla*), R. M. Dukes, C. T. Newton.

For some years after 1836 the boys proceeding to the universities owed of course a good deal to Dr. Butler, but Bishop Fraser, who was only three months under Kennedy, declared that from him he learnt how to read for himself; I believe that the Archbishop of York says the same thing. H. C. Rothery, late Wreck Commissioner, 10th wrangler in 1840, and Francis France, must also have been under Kennedy for a quarter only. Rothery was, I know, devoted to the Doctor. But the Classical Tripos of 1841, where Cope, Bather, Thring, headed the list, first shewed the new master in his full power. Then followed (1) at Cambridge, Munro, Morse, Cobbold, Gifford, Druce, M. Bright, W. G. Clark, R. E. Hughes, T. B. Lloyd, H. de Winton, J. T. Hibbert, H. C. A. Tayler, G. B. Morley, W. Stigant; in 1852 four first classes (R. Burn sen. aeq., Perring 4th, Chandless 5th, White 16th), H. A. Morgan, S. H. Burbury, H. Day, B. W. Horne, E. L. Brown, E. C.

Clark, A. W. Potts, S. Butler, Arthur Holmes, R. Whiting, H. M. Luckcock, H. C. Raikes, C. E. Graves, T. Gwatkin, H. W. Moss, W. F. Smith, T. W. Brogden, H. M. Gwatkin, F. Gunton, T. Moss, G. H. Hallam, G. H. Whitaker; (2) at Oxford, E. S. Foulkes, W. B. T. Jones now Bishop of St. David's, Lord Cranbrook, James Riddell,¹ Bishop How, F. Chalker, G. O. Morgan, F. Kewley, F. T. Colby, T. Clayton, W. Inge, J. E. L. Shadwell. Dr. Kennedy and Mr. Moss shared the credit won for the school by W. E. Heitland, R. D. Archer-Hind, T. E. Page at Cambridge, and A. H. Gilkes and F. Paget at Oxford. Mr. Hallam (*Journal of Education*, 1 May 1889, p. 240,) thus sums up the chief classical honours won by Dr. Kennedy's pupils (omitting prizes, except the Porson, and mathematical, scientific and theological honours, as well as the Oxford class list):

Of the boys who passed under his teaching in the Sixth Form, 42 gained a First in the Classical Tripos, of whom eleven were Senior Classics, nine held the second, and four the third place in the First Class. During the same period his pupils gained, at Oxford and Cambridge, eighteen Classical University Scholarships (not to mention Bell, Tyrwhitt, and Crosse Scholarships), and not less than twenty-three Porson Prizes, a distinction which Shrewsbury seemed to make peculiarly her own.² . . . It should be remembered that these distinctions, unapproached except by Eton, were gained by a school whose numbers during a great part of Dr. Kennedy's Headmastership were but little over 100, sometimes below that number; and that Shrewsbury, unlike Eton and Winchester, was a poor foundation, with no Entrance Scholarships to attract able boys. Able boys were indeed attracted to Shrewsbury, but the inducement which drew them there was the fame of the great teacher; and among the most brilliant scholars of the last decade of his Headmastership

¹ Dr Kennedy looked on Riddell as one of the best scholars, if not the very best, that he ever sent out. In the preface to the third edition of the *Sabrinæ Corolla* (13 Febr. 1867), he says: 'Cum iam sub praelo esset hæc Editio Tertia, unus isque natu minimus ex Tribus Viris, qui Floribus Legendis fuerant, Iacobus Riddell, A.M. Collegii Balliolensis Socius, mortalitatem explevit, qui qua indole virtutis fuerit, qua morum sanctitate, quam modesta constantia, quam suavi humanitate, quam accurata denique et eleganti doctrina, sciunt Oxonienses sui, eumque pari ac nos, praeceptor eius et condiscipulus, amore, luctu, desiderio prosequuntur. εἰρήνῃ τῇ εἰρηναίῃ.'

² Of 79 Porson prizes more than half, forty, have been won by Salopians.

were more than one who had failed to win Entrance Scholarships at Winchester and Eton.

In the preface to the first edition¹ of *Sabrinæ Corolla* (1 Febr. 1850) Dr. Kennedy pays a handsome tribute to his predecessor :

Etenim iam anni sunt amplius quinquaginta,² ex quo Regiæ Scholæ Salopiensi præfectus est Samuelis Butlerus, uir omni laude præstantior. qui quid ad litteras antiquas excolendas, quid ad pueros liberalius instituendos contulerit, sciunt quidem multi : quibus autem difficultatibus oblectatus id effecerit, paucis innuit, plerisque uix esset credibile. nobis igitur hoc opus aggredientibus spes illa calcar subdidit, fore ut uiri tanti tamque egregie meriti 'haerentem capiti multa cum laude coronam' nouis qualibuscumque floribus ornaremus.

Probably Dr. Butler's energy may have somewhat flagged during the thirteen years which elapsed between Kennedy's matriculation and 1836. But pupils still living speak with enthusiasm of his masterly versions, for example, of Horace, an author whom he knew by heart.

The dedication (dated Oct. 1864) of Munro's *Lucretius* begins thus :

MY DEAR DR. KENNEDY,

On the completion of a work which has cost both thought and labour I gladly dedicate it to you, to whom indirectly it owes so much. Many years have passed since the days when I was one of your earliest pupils at Shrewsbury ; but the memory of the benefits then received from your instructions is as fresh as ever. A succession of scholars year after year from that time to this will bear testimony to the advantages which they have derived from your zeal and varied knowledge ; and over and above all from that something higher which gave to what was taught life and meaning and interest : denn es muss von Herzen gehen, was auf Herzen wirken will.

In the memoir of Cope, by Munro, prefixed to *The Rhetoric of Aristotle with a commentary by the late Edward Meredith Cope* (Cambr. 1877), we read :

During the first years of his Shrewsbury life Dr Butler, late Bishop of Lichfield, was Headmaster ; for the last year and quarter Dr. Kennedy.

The last year and quarter of his residence at Shrewsbury was of vital importance for Cope's future career. Greek was the main and favorite study of his life ; and in the summer of 1836 Greek scholarship at Shrewsbury was, if not in comparison with other schools of the day, yet absolutely at a very low ebb. Boys were left in a great measure to their own natural lights. Now the light of nature seems capable in favorable circumstances of doing a good deal for Latin ; but in the case of Greek it fosters often the conceit of knowledge, but rarely indeed can impart the knowledge itself.

¹ The same edition concludes with 'Desiderium Samuelis Episcopi Lichfieldiensis,' an elegiac poem by Geo. A. Alston of Wadham college, B. A. 1844. On p. 328 is an engraved portrait of Ep. Butler by W. G. Mason after R. Clothier and T. Phillips.

² Dr. Butler was appointed in 1798, and held the post for 38 years.

When Dr. Kennedy came to Shrewsbury in the autumn of 1836, he proved himself equal to the task that was before him. Knowledge and method, united with kindness and enthusiasm, effected at once a marvellous change ; and all who were able and willing to learn felt in a few months that they had gotten such an insight into the language and such a hold of its true principles and idiom, as to render further progress both easy and agreeable. I would appeal to those who were high in the school at the time when the change in question took place, and ask them whether I have at all overstated the facts of the case ; I would refer to Henry Thring and John Bather who came next to Cope in the Classical Tripos ; to Francis Morse and others of the same year with myself, and many others.

But none was more conscious of what he owed to Dr. Kennedy, or was more ready to acknowledge it, than Cope himself.³ The judicious training and the well-directed reading of that year and quarter had an incalculable effect on his future career as a scholar ; and when he went to Cambridge in the October of 1837, he was prepared, as few are, to profit by the advantages the place afforded for classical study.

It must not be supposed that Dr. Butler left the school in a degenerate condition. Dr. Kennedy (evidence in report of commissioners, as cited below, II 327) bears witness to the contrary.

At Shrewsbury some reforms were needed ; but I had very little difficulty in achieving them, because I found a sixth form of high merit, ready and willing to cooperate with me, as I was ready and willing to consult with them, for the good of the school. Reference to the prize list under the years from 1839 to 1844 will shew the calibre of the senior boys whom I had then the happiness of teaching, while there are others also, doing excellently well in life, who were not competitors for university distinction. Dr. Arnold had shewn (what previous educators, conscientiously fearing to profane holy things or to promote hypocrisy, had doubted or denied)—that it was possible to bring religious influence to bear on boys in public schools.

Emboldened by his example, I took the first occasion of addressing the school in chapel on the duty of attending the holy communion, at the same time explaining the principle on which I should rigidly act, of severing this question from school discipline altogether, even to the extent of not allowing attendance or non-attendance to modify my reports of character and conduct. On the Sunday after the sermon 28 boys attended holy communion, for the first time at school, and the practice has continued, lately at a higher average of numbers, from that time to the present.

We have an account of Dr. Kennedy's work with the Sixth Form in an authentic shape, not magnified by idealising memory, in the *Report of H.M. Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Revenues and Management of certain Colleges and Schools*,

³ I can bear witness to this, from the very little that I saw of Cope. When he heard that Dr. Kennedy was pleased with the dedication of Munro's *Lucretius* he said : 'I wish I had known that he would care for such a thing.' More than once I heard him say that Dr. Kennedy was the best speaker that he had ever heard. J. E. B. M.

and the studies pursued and instruction given therein. Vol. II. Appendix. London 1864. p. 452.¹

3. Authors construed or translated *utua uoce*, and the quantity of each in the year ending with the summer holidays 1861.

Homer's Iliad book xviii, Odyssey book viii; Pindar, Nemea, Isthmia; Aeschylus, Septem c. Thebas, Choephoroi; Sophocles, Antigone, Oedipus Rex, Oedipus Coloneus; Aristophanes, Acharnenses, Equites, Vespae; Plato, Hippias Maior, Io; Thucydides, book iv; Aristotle, Ethics i and ii; Virgil, Aeneid vi, Georgic iv; Horace, carm. books i and iv, Epodes, Satires, book ii, Epistles, books i, ii, ad Pisones; Lucan, book i; Excerpta from Lucretius and Martial; Cicero, de Officiis, iii; epist. ad Att. ii; Philippii ii; Tacitus, Hist., book ii; Livy, books ix, x; St. Luke's Gospel; Epistles to Romans and Galatians; Classiques Français, St. Simon, Fontenelle, Montesquieu, Fénelon, etc. 80 pages.

4. Method of hearing the form in such construing or translating lessons.

The boy "called up" reads aloud the Greek or Latin till stopped, from 10 to 20 lines according to his calibre. Then he says the English of what he has so read, not being stopped in doing so unless he is actually wrong; but liable to correction at the close, for want of judgement or taste in his translating. He is then questioned on the passage as to matter, illustration, parsing, etc. according to need. He is then marked and another called up, and so on. When the lesson is thus gone through with the boys, I go through it again myself, construing, commenting, and explaining, the boys using their note-books.

My plan is always to have one Greek book, prose or verse, with one Latin book, verse or prose, on hand at the same time: as Thucydides and Horace, or Aeschylus and Livy, and about 80 lines of one are said with 40 lines of the other at second and third lessons. I finish a book, or a play, before going to another author. In examinations I lay great stress on preparation of matter, as well as style and verbal criticism.

5. Authors whose language has been committed to memory and the quantity of each in the same year.

Virgil, 3 books; Cicero, 30 chapters of 'de Officiis'; Sophocles, Ajax; Greek and Latin syntaxes, once a year each.

6. Authors whose substance and matter have been committed to memory, and the quantity of each in the same year.

Bible History, Wheeler's (one of the Testaments in a year); Roman History; Atwill's Universal History; Butler's Analogy. It must be observed that boys are advised and expected to read a great deal of matter not included in school lessons, and that they have a library containing such books as Grote's and Merivale's Histories, Pictorial and Macaulay's England, etc. etc.

Kinds and quantities of composition done in the form in the same year.

¹ In a life of Dr. Kennedy his own evidence and returns, and portions of the evidence of Mr. Graves, should be printed from this report, and also some of the testimony of the Commissioners, who after remarks on the success of Shrewsbury men in University competitions, add (vol. I p. 314): 'The extent to which this small school contributes to the teaching power of the Universities is not a little remarkable.'

Latin original verse. Heroic 12; Elegiac, 20; Lyric, 16; Exercises, about 1,000 lines in the year.² Latin themes: 26 in a year.

English. Four or five themes or essays in the year.

Translation.

English verse: sometimes an epigram (*ad libitum*) to translate.

10 or 12 passages into Latin verse, about three hundred lines in the year.

Greek: 200 iambics from Palaestra Musarum, no. 8, and trochaic or anapaestic occasionally for best scholars.

English prose: Cicero, de Officiis, about 30 chapters in the year.

Palaestra Stili and Curriculum into Latin once a fortnight, about 60 pages in the year; Arnold's Latin prose all once a year.

Passages occasionally given into Greek prose from Palaestra Stili, about 10 pages in the year; Arnold's Greek prose all done once a year.

In addition to these books read in the year 1860-1, there are specified, as belonging to the general stock in trade of the sixth form (p. 452), Barrett's Companion to the Greek Testament; Paley's Evidences; Easy Lessons in Reasoning. Euripides was read in the fifth form. In the sixth also were read Herodotus, Hesiod and Theocritus, Plautus and Catullus; never, I think, Pliny the younger or Quintilian, perhaps owing to the lack of convenient editions. In my time (1842-4) much attention was paid to the Thirty-nine Articles, which I (to confine myself to what I know for certain) studied with the help of three commentaries, not prescribed, but chosen by myself without consulting any one. I learnt to see in them a declaration of rights of national churches, and to say with F. D. Maurice and F. W. Newman (*Phases of Faith*. Ninth ed. 1874. p. 2):

Subscription was 'no bondage,' but pleasure; for I well knew and loved the Articles, and looked on them as a great bulwark of the truth; a bulwark, however, not by being imposed, but by the spiritual and classical beauty which to me shone in them.

To the study of the Articles I attribute the attraction which the authors of the Renaissance and Reformation have always since had for me.

By his mother's side Dr. Kennedy sprung from a Huguenot stock, and a perusal of his occasional sermons and pamphlets will shew that he was true to the family tradition. A Whig by birth and choice, he considered that his party had in the Lichfield House compact betrayed the principles of 1688. In

² This gives only 20 verses and a fraction as the average length of these compositions. In my time so little would not have been accepted; 30 was perhaps the average of the higher boys. I once sent very close on a hundred, and very often 50 to 60.

later years he followed with singular zest the trial of the Molly Maguires of Pennsylvania. Thus he was proof against the optimistic illusions, blinded by which Niebuhr sacrificed the Prussian episcopate to Rome, and Ranke declared that the question of papal supremacy has no longer any other than a historical interest. Rather he held with Thirlwall that the Vatican council was an event of far wider and more enduring importance than the Franco-German war.

The large amount of original composition demanded of us made us perforce students of three literatures. We read the masters of English prose to suggest thoughts for themes—e.g. I bought and read Richard Hooker's and Joseph Butler's works, as I did Molière's. For Latin verse I roamed far and wide in English poetry, perusing the whole of Shakespeare, which is more than I have done since; much of Milton I knew by heart: I was at home in the whole range of the *Corpus poetarum*; the odes of Horace, a Georgic and other parts of Virgil I constantly recited to myself as I walked to and from school. Many boys were masters of the Greek tragedians; I never took so kindly to Greek composition as to Latin, yet I learnt an entire play of Sophocles and often conned it over. Here I am a fair

average specimen of the effect of Dr. Kennedy's teaching, having no special aptitude for versification; what success I achieved, was due to very great labour at first and for some years; my poetic fervour cooled down as I approached my nineteenth birthday; at the university I seldom wrote a verse except for my tutor or in examination. As models of prose Plato, Demosthenes, Cicero, Livy, were often in our hands; accordingly we brought to college the power of understanding *sermones utriusque lingue* at sight. Our master took advantage of any passing event to give variety to our work. If Van Amburgh visited the town, his feats supplied matter for the next week's elegiacs. One morning we were bidden to bring at second lesson (10 o'clock) a version of an epitaph seen by the Doctor's nurse-maid in a country churchyard, and taught by her to his children. 'I think it does great credit to her taste.' The lines, with the Doctor's rendering, may be seen in *Between Whiles*.

She took the cup of life to sip,
Too bitter 'twas to drain;
She gently put it from her lip
And went to sleep again.

J. E. B. M.

THE REV. WALTER CLARK, B.D.,

Head Master of Derby School.

Died April 12, 1889.

By the death of the Rev. Walter Clark we have lost a typical and distinguished English Schoolmaster. A worthy pupil of that great teacher Dr. Kennedy, whom he survived so short a time, he was himself also 'ein Lehrer von Gottes Gnaden.'

His career seems to have begun at Coventry Grammar School where he was Head Boy. He afterwards was at Shrewsbury, and in time rose to the Captaincy, which, in a school so famous, is itself a distinction. He went to Cambridge as a scholar of Magdalene College. Here he was three times Prizeman in Classics, and became head of the men both of his own year and of the year above him. He read with several distinguished scholars, among whom were Paley and Shilleto. His place however in the Classical Tripos was a disappointment to himself and his friends: he was fourth in the Second Class. There

were only eleven in the First Class that year, and among them three University scholars. Perhaps this failure was partly caused by an act of self-sacrifice characteristic of the man and of an English University. In a term when he was reading hard one of the crew of his College boat was disabled about the time of the races. Mr. Clark was a powerful oarsman, but quite out of training. He consented to fill the vacant place, and the result was an illness which confined him for some time to his room. Though somewhat disheartened by his degree, he soon resolved with his habitual energy to make up for it, and after hesitating a short time whether he should try politics or the scholastic profession, he chose the latter. He soon established his reputation as an excellent master, and in 1865, at the early age of twenty-seven, was elected Headmaster of Derby School out of a long list of

candidates. At Derby he spent the rest of his life.

The school had been raised from a low position to a fair standard as regards numbers and efficiency by his predecessor, a man of considerable gifts; but Mr. Clark succeeded to it after a misfortune which had reduced its numbers very seriously. He found the state of it even worse than he expected, and, as he once told the writer, his heart at first sank within him; but he determined, in the manner which those who knew him will well understand, to make of Derby a Public School in the proper sense of the word.

The materials were unpromising. University honours were hardly known in the school. Some departments of athletics were unrepresented, the rest languished, and there was generally a want of the institutions which give a corporate character to school-life. Mr. Clark changed all this.

In education, no doubt, he had before him more or less consciously the traditions of Shrewsbury, but he held that there had been a wrong tendency in some of the great Public Schools to subordinate everything to Classics. He introduced the study of Natural Science into the school and developed that of Mathematics. He had a Civil Engineers' Class, he established a Modern Department for boys intended for business, and provided excellent instruction for Army and Civil Service candidates.

He was successful in many directions. The school took a fair place in Classics; it produced several high Wranglers, and among them a Senior and a Second Wrangler. Considerable distinctions were gained in Natural Science; and some of the boys in the Engineering Class took high places in the examination for Whitworth Scholarships. This prosperity was the more remarkable because the number of boys was never great. It once reached 140, but was often much below that. Perhaps Mr. Clark's secret was the example set by his own enthusiasm for the school, and the great interest he took in individual boys. He spared neither his time nor his money nor his health in the service of the school. His leisure was freely given to any boy who could really profit by it. Even those at the Universities were welcome to come in the vacation to read under his care and with his help. The writer is one of those who owe Mr. Clark a debt of gratitude for this generosity.

Mr. Clark was a man of some private fortune, which he spent liberally and even lavishly on the school. It was thus that he was able to maintain a staff of masters out of the usual proportion to the number of boys, to the great advantage of the education.

It was thus also that he gave the needful start to the athletic clubs; and helped them over difficulties when, as sometimes must happen in a school of such moderate size, their funds were not enough to maintain the standard of efficiency he aimed at. Besides this, the writer, who enjoyed his intimate confidence, knew of many acts of generosity to boys whose parents could not well bear all the expenses of education. He contributed a large sum to the fine set of buildings which he added to the school by public subscription.

His death is a loss not only to Derby School but to his University. Though he contributed nothing directly to Classical literature except some verses in the *Sabrinæ Corolla*, he was one of those men who make their University popular. Even those of us among his pupils who had intended to go to Oxford caught from him an enthusiasm for the Cambridge style of scholarship and for Cambridge scholars. The names he most delighted to honour were, after Kennedy himself, those of Shilleto, Paley, Munro, Mayor, and, in a younger generation, Arthur Holmes and Jebb. But he was a liberal-minded man; he had a high appreciation of the characteristics of Oxford education, and was a good judge of a boy's fitness for one University rather than another. In return his merits were warmly appreciated at Oxford outside the circle of his own pupils there.

Mr. Clark was taken away suddenly, at the age of fifty-one, from the very midst of his school work. His naturally strong constitution had already shown signs of giving way; he began to think of retiring, and his friends were sometimes anxious about him, thinking that he had overtasked his powers. It seems doubtful, however, whether the insidious and unsuspected disease which carried him off, had any connexion with the hard work he imposed on himself. His monument is the success of his school, and the deep affectionate regret of his pupils.

J. COOK WILSON.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

THE AEGIS OF ATHENE.

It is possible that a recent acquisition of the British Museum may throw some light on a subject which has been much discussed, the origin of the aegis of Athene. The leading passage is Herodotus, iv. 189, where he says that the Greeks had obtained their idea of the dress and aegis of Athene, as seen on statues of her, from Libya, where it was the custom to go clad in skins of animals which they called αἰγίδες. The manner of wearing these skins may be gathered from Dio Chrysostom. *Orat.* v., where he describes the Libyan monster as having the face of a beautiful woman and resembling γυναῖκα διφθέραν ἐπιβεβλημένην ἄνωθεν, ὥσπερ αἱ Λίβυσσαι, ἐπιδεικνύειν δὲ τὰ στῆθος καὶ τοὺς μαστοὺς καὶ τὸν τράχηλον ἀνακλῶσαν. That is to say, while her face and breast were exposed the back of her head seemed to be covered with the skin of some animal, a description which reminds us of the personifications of Africa, which have the back of the head covered with the skin of an elephant's head: similarly the Juno Sospita at Lanuvium wore the skin of an ibex just as Heracles wore in the same fashion the skin of the lion he had slain. In likening the daughters of Danaos to Libyan women, to certain nomads living near the Aethiopians, or to Amazons without their bows, Aeschylus (*Supp.* 275) appears to have had in his mind a costume in which a skin wrapped round the body was a prominent feature.

The passage of Herodotus ought therefore to mean that Athene had originally been represented in sculpture as wearing in the manner just described the skin of some creature. I will pass over an archaic vase in the British Museum on which is painted a possible figure of Athene wearing the skin of an ibex on her head, and ask what creature's skin Athene was most likely to wear. We know her title of Γοργοφόνα (Euripides, *Ion*, 1478), and it would be in accordance with primitive usage for her, after slaying the Gorgon, to throw its exuviae round her shoulders, not on her breast as in later art and literature (e.g. Euripides, *Ion*, 988). In Homer no doubt it was sufficient degradation to cut off the head of a slain enemy (*Iliad*, xviii. 176). But the instance of Heracles with the lion's skin, of Hades with a wolf's skin over his head on an Etruscan painting, the slaying of Marsyas, the Muses

decking themselves out with the feathers of their conquered rivals—point to an older custom of flaying the vanquished creature and throwing its skin round the shoulders and over the back of the head. I need not quote examples of the preservation in temples of the actual exuviae of monsters such as the Triton at Tanagra (Pausanias, ix. 20, 4), or of the Calydonian boar at Tegea (Pausanias, viii. 47, 1).

The cap of Hades which was lent to Perseus for the slaying of the Gorgon is represented in art as merely a winged petasos; but if the original idea of its shape resembled that of the Etruscan painting just mentioned, one could understand perhaps better its effect of rendering the wearer invisible by spreading terror all round. In a fragment of wall painting found at Mycenae we see human figures clad in skins apparently of horses, the animal's head forming a cap. The proverbial wolf in sheep's clothing would have first slain the sheep, before he got the fleece.

The acquisition of the Museum to which I began by referring is a very beautiful engraved gem in the form of a scarab of banded onyx set as a finger ring in gold with a bronze hoop. It was found at Amathus in Cyprus. The engraving exhibits a figure of Athene with helmet and spear but without shield. Behind her neck is seen in profile the Gorgon's head: lower down her back we see the snakes of the Gorgon which in later art formed the fringe of her aegis: then a pair of wings which I take to be those of the Gorgon, because Athene herself should not have wings: on the ground behind her feet fall three drops which I take to be σταλαγμοὶ αἵματος Γοργοῦς ἄπο (Euripides, *Ion*, 1003) like those which Athene collected and gave to Erichthonius. With her right hand Athene holds forward the skirt of her chiton in an archaic manner suitable to the archaic workmanship of the gem. But this hand seems to me also to hold an object which looks like the solitary eye of the Graiae which played so prominent a part in the slaying of the Gorgon.

We have thus on the new gem a hitherto unexpected representation of Athene. With the aegis on her breast she is as old as Pheidias at least. But it is possible, if not probable, that certain archaic figures of her on gems or vases, where the only visible trace of the Gorgon is a fringe of snakes on

her dress, may indicate that the face of the Gorgon is assumed to be invisible on her back.

A. S. MURRAY.

A Dictionary of Roman Coins, Republican and Imperial. By the late SETH WILLIAM STEVENSON. London: George Bell. 1889.

THIS is a thick volume of 929 pages, printed uniform with Dr. William Smith's Classical Dictionaries, and illustrated by more than 700 woodcuts. The author died in 1853, and had the work appeared at that time it might have been commended as a praiseworthy production of considerable usefulness, although it is evident that Mr. Stevenson both as a scholar and archaeologist was hardly the man to undertake single-handed a task which would tax the knowledge and energy of a Mommsen. Publication has however been long delayed, and unfortunately the book now appears without any revision worth the name. Mr. Roach Smith is stated to have 'revised' the manuscript from L to T, but he certainly has not brought it down to date. A small, and not important, portion of the dictionary, UV—Z, left unwritten by Mr. Stevenson, is well supplied by Mr. F. W. Madden, a competent numismatist, who however appeared on the scene too late to modify the general character of the work. I believe the fact is—though the publishers give no hint of it in their preface—that the bulk of the work was actually printed off many years ago. At any rate, there is hardly a single column in it which is not disfigured by obsolete and inadequate information. The authorities relied on begin with Ursinus and Vaillant, and end with Mionnet and Akerman, including, however, the great author of the *Doctrina Numorum Veterum*. Except in the small portion contributed by Mr. Madden there is no allusion to any of the best-known works on Roman Numismatics of the last twenty or thirty years, and even Mommsen is never cited. Under these circumstances it would be waste of time to criticize the shortcomings of the work in detail.

The illustrations are numerous, and are for the most part executed by the late Mr. Fairholt, a conscientious numismatic engraver, but one who was not successful in reproducing ancient portraits. As portraiture is of pre-eminent interest in the study of Roman coins, it is important that the specimens—at any rate the obverses—should be illustrated by photography and not by engraving.

In style, the book is irritatingly diffuse. It was unnecessary, for instance, in referring to an opinion of Pinkerton's, to speak of 'A later and perhaps more practised English numismatist [than Addison]—the dogmatical but still scientific and sagacious Pinkerton.' And the remarks of the late Admiral Smyth on Roman Baths—even 'though occurring in his equally pleasing and instructive work' on brass coins—need not have been eulogized as characteristic of 'the manly views and correct feelings of the gallant author.'

It would be unjust to the memory of Mr. Stevenson to omit a tribute to the courage and laborious care displayed in the production of this dictionary. It would be melancholy to think that his toil has been entirely in vain; and there is no doubt that a dictionary of Roman coins, or some work corresponding to Mr. Head's *Historia Numorum* is a distinct desideratum in numismatic study. Mr. Stevenson's work, disappointing as it is, will therefore probably be of some occasional service to numismatists and collectors. But it will have to be used with the utmost caution.

WARWICK WROTH.

THE AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES AT ATHENS, 1888-89.—The American School at Athens, founded in 1882, has in the seventh year of its existence entered upon a new era. Two great results, long and earnestly laboured for, have at last been achieved; the School now for the first time possesses a permanent home and a permanent director. The new building, designed by Prof. Wm. R. Ware of the Columbia School of Mines, was indeed ready for occupation in the spring of 1888 but, although the books and other property were then brought in, it was not until October that complete possession took place. The house is a fine and commodious one, situated on the southern slope of Lycabettus beside the British School, and commanding noble views of Pentelikon, Hymettus, and the Saronic Gulf from Salamis to Hydra, with the mountains of Argolis and even the Laconian Paros in the background. It contains, besides the apartments of the director, a large library and rooms for five or six students. The advantage, now first enjoyed by several members of the School, of living under the same roof with an excellent collection of books for purposes of study, cannot easily be overestimated. But the acquisition of a permanent director is more important than that of a permanent home. The system of annual appointments, followed during the first six years of the School's existence, was always regarded as a temporary one, and the founders and supporters of the institution have for some years been unflinching in their efforts to raise the endowment necessary to a suitable permanent appointment. Dr. Chas. Waldstein, upon whom fell the unanimous choice of the Managing Committee in November, 1886, assumed office at the beginning of the present academic year. And although it proved impossible for him to reside in Athens during this first year as long as was hoped and expected, he has already, in two visits of several

weeks each, made his talents, training and energy strongly felt for good. During his absence the interests of the School have been in the hands of Dr. F. B. Tarbell, the annual director, whose administration has been thoroughly able and efficient. It is expected that at least for the next few years Dr. Waldstein, without altogether giving up his present work in Cambridge, will reside in Athens during the winter or somewhat longer. An annual director will still be sent out from one of the colleges associated in the maintenance of the School, who will have charge of the School during the director's absence, and in general will cooperate with him on the conduct of the School. During the year 1889-90 this office will be held by Prof. S. Stanhope Orris, L.H.D. There is also some talk of appointing a permanent Secretary, to assist in giving continuity to the work of the School.

Eight students have been in attendance, six of them for the major part of the year. Regular exercises have been held by the directors for the study of topography, inscriptions and the history of Greek Art, as well as for the reading of ancient Greek authors. There have been also occasional meetings for the presentation of papers embodying the fruits of original research, to which meetings others than students, whether residents of Athens or visitors, who are interested in archaeological work, have been invited. Similar meetings are held by the German and British Schools, and prove of great service in promoting scientific activity. The American School has also been enabled, thanks to the Archaeological Institute of America, and to Messrs. Wesley Harper, H. G. Marquand and other friends, to conduct excavations on a more considerable scale than heretofore. The remarkably successful work begun at Dionysos (Ikaria) by Mr. C. D. Buck in the spring of 1888 was completed by him in the autumn. Another member of the School, Mr. H. S. Washington, was entrusted with investigations, carried on at his own expense, at two points in the neighbourhood of Stamata, a village to the north of Pentelikon, about half way between Kephissia and Marathon. These resulted in the identification, by means of inscriptions, of the site of the deme Plotheia. In the spring Dr. J. C. Rolfe took charge of excavations in Boeotia, first for three weeks at Anthedon, afterwards for a few days each at Thisbe and Plataea. The campaign at Anthedon resulted in laying bare the foundations of a large and irregular building, of which a portion had been previously in sight and which Leake mistakenly supposed to be a temple; in unearthing the foundations of a small building, perhaps the temple of Dionysos (Paus. ix. 22, 6); in the discovery of various small objects of terra-cotta and of a large and important collection of bronze tools; and in a considerable harvest of new inscriptions. The work at Thisbe was comparatively unproductive. That at Plataea, which in Dr. Waldstein's opinion is destined to yield rich treasures, was suspended before noteworthy discoveries in the line of architecture or sculpture had been made, but not without securing a long Latin inscription, in a tolerable state of preservation. Even moderately successful excavations have immense value to those engaged in them, there being nothing so stimulating as the discovery of fresh materials for study. Full accounts of the enterprises above named will appear in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, which has been recently made the official organ of the School and which has undertaken to meet the need for that speedy publication which archaeological explorations demand.

P.S.—Prof. Tarbell finds that the Latin inscription discovered at Plataea is a large fragment of the

preamble to the famous edict of Diocletian, *De pretiis rerum venalium*. The two copies of the preamble which are already known, the Exemplum Stratonicense and the Exemplum Aegyptiacum, are not quite complete, and our text will fill most of the gaps. Unfortunately no part of the list of prices has been found as yet. All the fragments of Diocletian's edict hitherto found in Greece (at Geronthrae, Megara, Lebadea, Carystus) are written in Greek.

THE NEW HEAD OF IRIS ON THE PARTHENON FRIEZE.—With reference to the figure of Iris on the east frieze of the Parthenon, the head of which was some months ago happily found in excavations on the Acropolis of Athens, and at the time identified by Dr. Waldstein, I wish to observe that her position so close beside Hera seems to illustrate the epithet ἄρχου ὁ ἰσταίνω, which Homer so frequently applies to Iris. As the messenger of Hera, she conveyed her message standing close to the person for whom it was meant, and probably this was her habitual attitude. There is so much of a Homeric character in the frieze, that one would gladly see this meaning in her attitude. So far as I remember, this point has not been noticed by archaeologists. Flasch (*Zum Parthenon Fries*, p. 16) in arguing for the appellation of Iris as against Nike, which many others preferred, says that the position of Iris was *ad latūs* of Hera, and that quite describes her attitude on the frieze, but it does not recall the Homeric epithet, nor does Flasch suggest anything of the kind. It may be a question whether Iris had the power of announcing to Hera any approaching incident, such as the arrival of the Panathenaic sacrifice. In any case her habitual attitude of standing close to the person with whom for the time she was concerned may be said to be fully illustrated on the Parthenon frieze.

A. S. MURRAY.

ACQUISITIONS OF BRITISH MUSEUM.

1. An oblong plate of bronze 1½ in. by ¾ in.; with incised inscription

MASSAPONTIS
VERIANTIO
CHIEPAR
TENIV'V'C'C
EXOP'P'BC



referring to a property (massa) known as the Pons Veri belonging to two viri clarissimi, Antiochus and Parthenius, on whom it appears to have been bestowed ex pecunia publica: *Bullettino dell' Inst. Arch.* 1865, p. 115.

2. A terra-cotta statuette from Tanagra, 7½ in. high, representing a Muse seated on a rock and holding on her knee a Satyric mask; in her right hand is a tibia (?).

3. Two leaden spindle-whorls, from Old Cairo.

4. Marble portrait head, life-size, of a bearded man: worked in one piece, for insertion into a statue. Very late rude work, possibly provincial Roman.

5. a. Cornelian scaraboid; ram's head: from Greece.

- b. Paste scaraboid; female head: from Odessa.

- c. Bronze perforated disk, ⅞ in. diameter; on each side a lion, intaglio: from Odessa.

6. a. Banded onyx, intaglio: Hercules seated, holding lyre and club; inscribed ΑΔΜΩΝ: from Italy.

b. Sard intaglio : Cupid running, armed with helmet, sword, and shield.

c. Onyx cameo : girl laying offering on altar.

7. Agate scaraboid : bull : said to have been found in Athens.

8. a. Plasma scarab : Isis and Horus in a field of flowers, conventionally arranged around them. Chiusi, from the Hamilton Gray collection.

b. Green jasper scarab : monkey walking. Hertz collection.

9. a. Marble torso of archaic style : a draped female figure holding a dove on her breast. Bought in Syme. Probably found on the site identified as Pedasa by Judeich in *Athenische Mittheilungen*, xii. p. 335, but which has since been identified with Theangela, see *Classical Review*, ante pp. 139 and 234. Cf. also *Phil. Wochenschrift*, 1888, p. 1516, where Furtwängler writing from Odessa says . . . 'ein kleiner archaischer marmortorso, Aphrodite (?) bekleidet, eine Taube an der Brust haltend. Ein überaus ähnliches Stück das aus Samos kam, sah ich unlängst in London.' Samos is here probably a mistake for Syme.

b. Part of a large r.f. krater, giving portions of the obverse and reverse, with an elaborate anthemion pattern between them. On the *obv.* is Hermes standing in front of a quadriga, as on the kylix in the British Museum painted by Euphronios (Klein, *Euphronios* p. 88). On the reverse is Dionysos ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ, and a female figure. This fragment has belonged to a vase of the same shape and style of drawing as the krater in the Louvre by Euphronios, and there seems little doubt that this vase was also from his hand.

10. a. Vase of Corinthian fabric in form of a duck : from Santa Maria di Capua.

b. Archaic marble xoanon of the 'violin' form : from Amorgos.

c. Lenticular gem in green jasper : from Melos.

d. Part of a bronze disk, with engraved and punctured designs : from Cervetri.

e. Part of an archaic terra-cotta plaque with a figure in relief : a female seated in a chair with hands raised : from near Naples.

f. Bearded mask in terra-cotta painted red and blue : Capua (?).

g. Silver bulla, inscribed *obv.* ATILIVS, *rev.* ANTIGONES : from Rome.

h. Mask of a Gorgon : apparently part of a large archaic bucchero vase : from near Naples.

i. Bearded term, in ivory : Tarentum.

k. Bone circular tessera inscribed *obv.* MESSALINA, *rev.* III : Naples.

l. Ivory fibula in form of a dolphin, the eyes set with coral : Tarentum.

m, n. Bronze handles of vases terminating in bearded masks : Aradus.

o. Bronze intaglio : laureate head of Caracalla, inscription illegible, diameter $1\frac{1}{2}$ in. : Sardes.

p. Terra-cotta disk, stamped ΠΑΙΤΩΣ : Tarentum.

11. a. Terra-cotta impression from a gem : Victory inscribing on a shield.

b. Ivory tessera inscribed T : from Ephesos.

12. Bronze tessera, *obv.* head of Constantine, *rev.* HA.

13. a. The gem described in Mr. Murray's paper above.

b. Sard intaglio with Gnostic design, a vase between two branches encircled by a serpent, and the inscription ΑΒΡΑΚΑΡΕ : *rev.* ΓΕΒΕΡ found in Cyprus.

ZAHΛ

14. a. Lenticular gem, engraved with the figure of a hippocamp : from the Greek islands.

b. Similar gem, engraved with a cuttlefish : Melos.

15. A gladiator's tessera in ivory, inscribed on four sides :—

(i.) MODERATVS, the name of the gladiator.

(ii.) LVCCEI, the name of his patron.

(iii.) SP · III · NON · OCT · the day of the month in which he was 'spectatus.'

(iv.) L · MINIC · L · PLOTIO · Names of the two Consuls for the year.

They appear to be the Consuls for the year 88 A.D., Minicius Rufus and Plotius Grypus, both of whose praenomina have been until now uncertain (Klein's *Fasti Consulares*, p. 49). Found in 1886 in excavations at Civita Lavinia (Lanuvium).

CECIL SMITH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Athenaeum : 23 March, review of Postgate's *New Latin Primer*. 13 Apr. Penrose's *Athenian Sculpture*. 20 Apr. Leeuwen and da Costa's *Iliad*, Maass' *Scholia Townleyana*, Way's *Translation of Iliad* vol. II., and Lanciani's *Rome*. 27 Apr. notices of Gilmore's *Persika of Ktesias*, Strachan-Davidson's *Polybius*, Shilleto's *Plutarch's Morals*, A Stewart's *Seneca's Minor Dialogues*. 11 May, Hardy's *Pliny's Correspondence with Trajan*, and Duruy's *Histoire des Grecs* III.

Academy : 30 March, H. Hager on Hirschfeld's *Griech. Grabschriften*. 20 Apr. F. Haverfield on *Portus Adurni*. 27 Apr. W. Sanday on Hatch's *Essays in Biblical Greek*. 4 May, Wilkins on Hardy's *Pliny*. 11 May, W. Sanday on P. Corssen's review of *Old Latin Biblical Texts*; letters from Wilkins and Hardy on above review.

The Expositor. Nos. 49-53 (Jan. to May, 1889). In Nos. 50, 52, 53, W. M. Ramsay continues his papers on 'Early Christian Monuments in Phrygia.

While dwelling on the influence of the ecclesiastical leaders, he brings evidence to show that in early days they were known as presbyters only, and that it was not till after the time of Montanus, who represented the old school of Phrygian Christians, that the new ecclesiastical organization was established, with bishops in every city, on the lines of the civil administration of the province. He quotes, with many improved readings, the epitaph of Avircius, the chief opponent of Montanus in Phrygia; and shows, from the legends connected with his name, and that of Antemon, that remarkable natural phenomena, which had been ascribed to the Pagan gods or heroes, were speedily transferred to their saints by the Christians. In Nos. 50-53, A. B. Bruce continues his notes on the Ep. to the Hebrews. His interpretation of Heb. ii. 9 is discussed by A. B. Davidson and G. G. Findlay, in Nos. 50 and 51. Other papers of interest are (in 49), Archdeacon Farrar on the relation between the last nine chapters of Ezekiel and Levit. xvii.-xxvi.; S. R. Driver illustrates from Jewish tradition 1 Cor. x., 4

Gal. iii. 16, Eph. iv. 8; F. Rendall writes on the Scriptural idea of the priesthood; J. A. Beet on Epaphroditus; Delitzsch declares his adherence to the old, as opposed to the new theology; Recent English literature on the N.T. (also in 52). 50. The Dean of Armagh has an interesting study on the Apostles, continued in the next number; E. G. King on the Hallel. 51. An ingenious paper by F. H. Chase, in which Vischer's hypothesis as to the Apocalypse is tested by applying it to the epistles to the Thessalonians; Farrar's 'Lives of the Fathers,' by M. Dodds; T. K. Cheyne gives an account of a paper by the Syrian Archbishop of Damascus on the language spoken by Christ. 52. Archdeacon Farrar on St. James the Apostle; J. J. Murphy compares the parables of the 'Labourers in the Vineyard,' and 'The Prodigal Son'; G. S. Selby on the Swine of Gadara. 53. S. R. Driver discusses the variations from the Hebrew in the LXX, version of Jeremiah, with reference to a book by Prof. Workman of Canada; J. R. Lumby points out the indifference shown by the N.T. writers as regards questions of authorship or verbal exactness in their quotations from the O.T.; W. W. Peyton considers that the motive of the first temptation was not the personal feeling of hunger, of which we hear nothing till the end of the forty days, but sympathy with the poverty of the mass of mankind. It is a pity that an interesting paper should be written in such a remarkable style, e.g. "after the ritual, our Lord hurries into a wild, weird, lone waste, carrying a flood of great thoughts, to inspect the elements of the situation. The creation of a spiritual humanity of a superior order is the gravity upon his mind."

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie u. Pädagogik.
Ed. Fleckeisen u. Masius. (Leipzig, 1888).

Heft 12 contains: (1) M. Hecht, *Cultur-historische Forschungen zum Homer. Zeitalter*, almost entirely notes on the morals of the heroic age.—(2) J. Sturm, *Zu den ἐντομαὶ der Odyssee*, a collation of the lines as given in Vatic. gr. 1898 fol. 219.—(3) J. A. Simon, *Zu Xen. Hellenika*, a number of emendations.—(4) H. Kothe, *Zu den Fragm. des historikers Timaios*, an attempt to restore a table of contents of Timaios' book, with notes on some particular fragments.—(5) K. Tümpel, *Achilleus u. die Lesbische Hierapolis*, a criticism of the myth which tells that Achilles sacked Lesbos.—(6) W. Soltan, *Zu den Römischen Tagen*, a paper on the calendar before Caesar in three parts (a) on *dies nefasti*, showing that the N^o or N^o of the calendars means N^o(estas) F^{er}(iae) P^u(blicae) (b) on *dies fasti* after the *Xvirate*, (c) on *fictive dies fasti*, dealing in great detail with the regular and anomalous *dies fasti*.—(7) M. C. Gertz *Adnotatiunculae Criticae in Apocolocyntosin*, as edited in Weidmann's *Petroneus*.—(8) F. Giesing, *Verstärkung u. Ablösung in der Cohorten Legion*, a very long discussion founded on Fröhlich, of the disposition of cohorts in Caesar's *acies*. The conclusion of it seems to be that there was no *quincunx* and no interval between the cohorts of the first line, as commonly supposed, but the reserve lines followed close on the heels of the front, and as single files in front were killed or fell out, the corresponding files of the reserve took their places.—(9) H. Steuding, *Zu Cic. Cato Major*, proposing *id ipsum ut cuique tubebit* in § 58.—(10) L. Gurlitt, *Genera Usitata Epistularum*, showing first, from *Cic. ad fam.* II. 4 and IV. 13, what the recognised kinds of letters were, and concluding with a suggestion that *ad fam.* V was a collection intended to be homogeneous, comprising letters of complaint and consolation.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie u. Pädagogik.
Ed. Fleckeisen u. Masius. (Leipzig, 1889).

Heft 1 contains: (1) W. Schwartz, on E. H. Meyer's *Indogerm. Mythen II. Achilleis*, 'elaborate

but not written from the right point of view.'—(2) F. Vollbrecht, on *παπαλαδεις*, to which the writer assigns some such meaning as 'rising and dipping.'—(3) Ö. Immisch, *Ad Hipponactis Fragm.* suggesting *γαστριχ(μ)αιραν* for *γαστριμ(μ)αχαιραν* in fr. 85.—(4) W. H. Roscher, *Der Thesaurus der Egestaster auf dem Eryx* suggesting *δραγγυρά* for *ἀργυρά* in Thuc. vi. 46, 3.—(5) F. Reuss, *Observationes Criticae in Polytaeni Strategemata*.—(6) M. Schneider, *Zu Plutarch's Eumenes*, contending that E's wife was not Barsine, but Artone.—(7) J. Weisweiler, *Zur Erklärung der Arvalacten*, chiefly on the words *adolendae commolendae deferundae coinquendae*, a very long discussion.—(8) K. Schliack, *Zu Cic. Laelius*, two emendations.—(9) H. Hecker, *Die Alamannenschlacht bei Strasburg* (fought A.D. 357), chiefly a discussion of views recently published by W. Wiegand.—(10) O. Keller, *Zu Hor. Epoden* suggesting that in *Epod.* 17, 1. *iamiam* should be printed as one word, as Hor. only elides pronominal monosyllables.

Jahresberichte des philologischen Vereins zu Berlin. Jan.-March, 1889.

LITERATURE OF LIVY by H. J. Müller.

Moritz Müller, *T. Livii ab urbe condita liber I.* 2nd ed., 'a sterling work:' for § 13 *violatum hospitii foedus*, the conj. of Perizonius, rev. suggests *violati hospitii scelus*. In 30 § 2 *Julius* must be read as the Tullii came from Corniculum, not Alba. A. Mikenda, *T. Livii a.u.c. libri I. et XXI.* 21, 40, 7 *paene* taken from its place and put before *partibus*. 1, 42, 2 *cum invidia* for *quin in.* after R. Novák.—F. Luterbacher, *T. Livii a.u.c. liber VI.*, the MSS. often defended with much judgment: rev. 17 § 6 *remisso co* for *remisso id.* Lat. *repente id.*—Aug. Luebs, *T. Livii a.u.c. libri Vol. III. libri XXI-XXV.* For the first time we have a complete collation of the Puteanus as well as of C. and M.—O. Riemann et E. Benoist, *T. Livii a.u.c. libri XXI et XXII.* 5th ed.: in 21, 10, 12 *posset* for *possit* rightly.—J. Ley, *Hilfsbuch für den lateinischen Unterricht. Erklärende Bemerkungen zum Livius lib. XXI.* 'cannot be considered successful.'—Otto Kimmig, *Spicilegium criticum*: in 23, 11, 7 *Brutiorum <aliorum>que quae*, better B. *quaeque <aliae>*.—H. J. Müller, *Æque bei Livius*, Rhein. Mus. 1888. 'In most places this ending is not to be touched.'—V. Voss, *Beiträge zur Kritik des Livinustextes*: in 21, 26, 7 *et* is struck out: rather, read *illorum* for *eorum*.—H. J. Müller, *Zu T. Livius*, Zeitsch. f. d. österr. Gymn. 1888: 21, 5, 13 *at ex parte altera [ripae]*; 8, 4 *<ubi> multifariam*; 23, 36, 10 *prodigiis <procuandis>*; 40, 7 *ita occasio Hampsiacorae data est*; 31, 18, 7 *discurrerent per omnes vias seque ipsi laeti interficerent*; 36, 7 *ut cresceret cum audacia simul et negligentia hosti (=non solum aud. sed etiam neg.)*.—O. Riemann, *Du texte des livres XXVI-XXX. de Tite-Live*, maintains that P rather than S must be taken as base of text; 26, 47, 7 *libras* of P may be kept where Madv. followed by other edd. has *librae*.—M. Müller, *Zur Kritik und zum Sprachgebrauch des Livius*, shows that Madv's preference for M is not justified.—W. v. Hartel, *Kritische Versuche zur fünften Dekade des Livius*, a great number of conjectures.—H. J. Müller, *Zu den Fragmenten des Livius (N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 1888)*, seeks to show that two fragments under the name of Livy (one in Nonius and the other in Pseudo-Probus) do not belong to the historian, but the former to Livius Andronicus and the latter to Lucilius. Among many scattered contributions, neither of the insertions of H. Nettleship (*Journ. Phil.* 1887, p. 190) in 2, 21, 4 and 3, 5, 14 are approved. In 4, 17, 12 *saepiri* for *sequi*, and 9, 39, 10 *ceteri omnes* for *ceteriorem*, by F. J. Drechsler are approved. In the difficult passage 42, 30, 1 rev. reads in *libris*

of all the more important Homeric questions, and is written in an animated style' [see *Class. Rev.* II. 255]. E. Krönert, *Zur Homerlektüre*. I. Teil: *Homericische Epithela und Gleichnisse*.—W. Helbig, *Das Homerische Epos aus den Denkmälern erläutert*, 2nd ed. Indispensable for Homer.—E. Kuhnert, *Daidalos, ein Beitrag zur griechischen Künstlergeschichte* [*N. Jahrb. f. Phil.* 1887]. An excursus on Σ 590 foll.—B. Mangold, *La ville homérique*. Elucidation of the use of πόλις, ἄστυ, δῆμος, ἀγορά, etc.—A. Breusing, *Nautisches zu Homeros* [*N. Jahrb. f. Phil.* 1885-6-7]. A discussion and explanation of the following words: (1) στείρα, πορφύρεον (β 427), λειδῆς, ἡεροειδῆς; (2) ἱστόι (ζ 271), not 'masts' but 'loom-beams'; (3) τὸ ἰφολκκαίον (ξ 350); (4) δρύοχοι (τ 574); (5) πλωτὴ ἐνὶ νῆσσι; (7) οὐκ ἴδμεν, ὅση ὁδὸς οὐδ' ὄρη ἦν. In his book *Die Nautik der Alten*, Bremen, 1886, B. has rendered great service to Homer.—M. Hergt, *Quam vere de Ulxis erroribus Eratosthenes pūctaverit*. Eratosthenes had the conviction ποιήτην πάντα στοχάζεσθαι ψυχαγωγίας, οὐ διδασκαλίας and forbade ἱστορίαν ζητεῖν ἀπὸ ποιημάτων. H. goes further than E. in this direction.

Rivista di Filologia e d' Istruzione Classica. Ed. Comparesi, Müller and Flechia (Torino, 1888—1889).

Fascicolo 4th—6th contains: (1) C. Pascal, *De Quintilio Varo Cremonensi poeta*, maintaining that the Quintilian of Hor. *Carm.* i. 24 was Quintilius Varus (praenomen probably Lucius), a poet quite distinct from L. Varius, with whom he is generally confused, and also from Alfenus Varus.—(2) G. Antonibon, *Contributi agli studi sui libri De Lingua Latina*, containing first a careful description of the MS. authorities and afterwards a very large collection of emendations.—(3) C. Giambelli, *Appunti sui fonti delle opere filosofiche di Cicerone*, dealing with Panaetius, Antiochus and Diodotus, and concluding the series of articles.—(4) G. Suster, *De altera quadam scriptura orationis quae a Maecio Falconio Nicomacho Tacito Augusto habita est*, a new

reading of the speech, from three MSS. of the *Panegyrici*, quite different from that given by Vopiscus. (The number concludes with several brief notices of German books and extracts from foreign publications, including the *Classical Review*.)

Fasc. 7th—9th contains: (1) D. Largajolli e P. Parisio *Nuovi Studi intorno a Giuliano imperatore*, dealing particularly with six letters of Julian discovered in 1885 at Calchis in the Sea of Marmora.—(2) A. Pais, *Le Prime Sei Odi del Libro III di Orazio*, an article founded on a paper read by Th. Mommsen, on Jan. 24, 1889, to the Berlin Academy of Sciences, to the effect that *Carm.* iii. 1—6 are a cycle of odes in honour of Augustus and his reforms.—(3) A. Cima, *Analecta Vergiliana et Tulliana*, a suggested rearrangement of the lines in *Elegia in obitum Maecianae* (Baehrens, *P. L. M.* I. 119).—(4) E. Cocchia, *Gli studi classici in relazione con la cultura etc.*, an essay in support of classical schools, suggested chiefly by the intellectual progress of Germany. The number concludes, after the usual brief reviews, with a notice, translated from *Berliner Philolog. Wochenschr.* 1889, No. 3, of a lately-discovered speech of Hyperides against one Athenogenes.

Archaeological Journal. Nos. 177-181 (vols. xlv.-xlvii.).

xlv. (167-186), *Roman Inscriptions found in Britain in 1887*, by W. T. Watkin. This is Mr. Watkin's last article: he died March 23, 1888. The series is to be continued by Mr. Haverfield.—(221-237 and 351-358), *Roman Antiquities in Touraine*, by B. Lewis. xlv. (1-6), *Roman Life in Egypt*, by Flinders Petrie.—(7-11), *The Warwick Vase*, by E. C. Clark.—(46-64), *Roman Architecture in Leicester*, by G. E. Fox.—(65-72), *Notes on Roman Britain*, by F. Haverfield (i.) In Tac. *Ann.* xii. 31 read *castris ad Trisantonam*, the latter representing the Tren or Tern (ii.) The Roman road marked by Richard of Cirencester and Rübner as running from Chichester to Pevensey is unproven; (iii.) on *C.I.L.* vii. 14 and 17.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

Liddell and Scott. An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon newly abridged from the 7th edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon. Small 4to. Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d.
Lucretius. Selections from. With Notes by Thomas J. Dymes. Cr. 8vo. pp. 128. Rivington. 2s. 6d.
Ovid. *Metamorphoses*, Book XI. 18mo. pp. 88. Latin text. With Notes. Parker, 1s.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

Anacreon. Anacreonte ed Anacreontee, ad uso delle scuole con commento di C. O. Zuretti. 8vo. 116 pp. Torino, E. Loescher. 11. 80.
Baroni (A.) Tito Livio nel rinascimento. 16mo. (vii, 77 pp.) Pavia, Fratelli Fusi.
Bibliographie über die römische Literaturgeschichte in Russland vom Jahre 1709—1889 mit Einleitung und Registern herausgegeben von D. von Naguiewski. 8vo. Kasan. 48 pp. (In Russian.) Mk. 1.
Bouterweck (R.) Kleine lateinische Stilistik und Aufsatzlehre, als Anhang zu jeder lateinischen Grammatik bearbeitet 8vo. iii, 64 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. Boards. Mk. 1.
Cicero. Cato major de senectute. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von H. Anz. Ausgabe A. Kommentar unterm Text. 8vo. iv, 66 pp. Gotha, F. A. Perthes. 90 Pfg.
Ausgabe B. Text und Kommentar getrennt. 2 parts. 27 and 38 pp. 90 Pfg.
— De Oratore. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von K. W. Piderit. 6te Auflage besorgt von O.

Postgate (J. P.) Sermo Latinus: a Short Guide to Latin Prose Composition. Post 8vo. pp. 90. Macmillan. 2s. 6d.
Virgil. The Eclogues and Georgics. Translated from the Latin by J. W. Mackail. Roy. 16mo. pp. 128. Rivington. 5s.

Harnecker. Heft 2. Buch II. 8vo. pp. 217—395. Leipzig, Teubner. Mk. 1.50.
— Rede gegen C. Verres. Buch IV: de signis. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von K. Hachtmann. Ausgabe A. Kommentar unterm Text. 8vo. vi, 107 pp. Gotha, F. A. Perthes. Mk. 1.30.
Ausgabe B. Text und Kommentar getrennt. 2 parts. iv, 54 and 52 pp. Mk. 1.30.
— Opera nonnullis Patrum Societatis Jesu notis illustrata. Tomus II. ad usum humanitarum. 12mo. 160 pp. Tours, Mame.
— Tomus VI. ad usum sextanorum. 12mo. 72 pp. Tours, Mame.
Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca edita consilio et auctoritate Acaemiae litterarum regiae borussicae. Vol. XIX. parts I. II. 8vo. Berlin, G. Reimer. Mk. 19.
Contents I. Aspasii in Ethica Nicomachea quae supersunt commentaria. II. Heliodori in Ethica Nicomachea paraphrasis, edidit G. Heylbut. xii, 245, and viii, 246 pp.

- Demosthenes.* Le orazioni olintiache commentate da D. Bassi. 8vo. 195 pp. Torino, E. Loescher, 21. 50.
- Fourer* (E.) Ephemerides Caesarianae rerum inde ab ineunte bello Africano usque ad extremum bellum hispaniense gestarum. 8vo. 48 pp. Bonn, Hanstein. Mk. 1.20.
- Franke* (J.) De Tib. Silii Italici Punicorum tropis. Commentatio philologica. 8vo. 128 pp. Münster. Mk. 1.50.
- Grosse* (H.) Beiträge zur Syntax des griechischen Mediums und Passivums. 8vo. 15 pp. Dramburg. 75 pp.
- Gylling.* De argumenti dispositione in satiris IX-XVI Juvenalis. 12mo. 150 pp. Lund, Möller. Mk. 1.80.
- Heisterbergk* (B.) Fragen der ältesten Geschichte Siciliens. 8vo. vii, 106 pp. Berlin, Calvary and Co. Mk. 4.
(Berliner Studien für Classische Philologie, IX. 3.)
- Hentze* (C.) Die Parataxis bei Homer. II. 4to. 16 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 80 Pfg. (I und II. Mk. 2.)
- Hermes* (F.) Neue Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Catull. 4to. 16 pp. Frankfurt a/Oder. 60 Pfg.
- Hoffmann* (K.) De Pseudo-Orphei Catalogo Argonautarum. Nürnberg, 1888. 39 S.
- Homer, Ilias.* Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von G. Stier. Heft 5. Gesang XIII-XV. Gotha, F. A. Perthes.
Ausgabe A. Kommentar unterm Text. 8vo. iv, pp. 425-534. Mk. 1.50.
Ausgabe B. Text und Kommentar getrennt. 2 parts. pp. 213-270 und iv, 209-259. Mk. 1.50.
- Huber* (J.) Die Ursachen der Verbannung des Ovid. Altes Gymn. zu Regensburg. 35 pp.
- Inshof-Blumer* und *O. Keller.* Tier und Pflanzenbilder auf Münzen und Gemmen des klassischen Altertums. 26 plates. 4to. x, 168 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Boards. Mk. 24.
- Jahrbuch des kaiserlichen deutschen archäologischen Instituts. Herausgeber, Heft I. Prof. Conze. Band IV. 1889. 4 Hefte. 4to. Berlin. G. Reimer. Mk. 16. 90, 27 pp. Illustrations and 2 plates.
- Juvenal.* Saturae cum lectionum varietate commentariis proemiis et indice absoluto edidit Daus Naguiewski. Vol. I. Prolegomena et satirae I. II. III. continens. 8vo. Kasan. 1888. 229 pp. Plate. 8 Mk. (Commentary in Russian.)
— Saturae. Erklärt von A. Weidner. 2te umgearbeitete Auflage. 8vo. xxxii, 313 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Mk. 4.40.
- Klotz* (P.) De Ciceronis librorum de officiis fontibus. Dissertatio inauguralis. 8vo. 39 pp. Greifswald. Mk. 1.
- Krauss* (L.) Griechische Partikeln. Anhang zur Schulgrammatik mit Beispielen. 8vo. 50 pp. Ansbach, Brügel und Sohn. Boards. 60 Pfg.
- Lammert* (E.) Polybios und die römische Taktik. Teil I. 4to. 24 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs. Mk. 1.
- Livy.* Liber VII. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von F. Luterbacher. 8vo. 97 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Mk. 1.20.
- Lucretius.* Traduction complète en vers par E. Miélet. Préface par Georges Renard. 12mo. xii, 279 pp. Paris, Perrin et Cie.
- Madoig* (J. N.) L'état romain, sa constitution et son administration, traduit par C. Morel. Tome V. (Inst.) 8vo. Paris, Vieweg. 7 f. 50.
- Marx.* Hilfsbüchlein für die Aussprache der lateinischen Vokale in positionslangen Silben. Mit einem Vorwort von F. Bücheler. Wissenschaftliche Begründung der Quantitätsbezeichnungen in den lateinischen Schulbüchern von H. Perthes. 2te Auflage. 8vo. xii, 84 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. Mk. 2.40.
- Neubner* (F.) Apologi graeci antiquissimi historia critica. Dissertatio inauguralis. 8vo. 86 pp. Cologne. 2 Mk.
- Nöthe* (H.) Der delische Bund, seine Einrichtung und Verfassung. 4to. 43 pp. Magdeburg. 1 Mk.
- Oehler* (W.), *Schubert* (G.), und *Sturmhofel* (K.) Übungsbuch für den grammatischen Unterricht im Lateinischen. Teil I für Sexta, mit einem Wörterverzeichnis. 8vo. vi, 147 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Mk. 1.20.
- Pernice* (E.) Galeni de ponderibus et mensuris testimonia. Dissertatio philologica. 8vo. 64 pp. Bonn. 1888. Behrendt. Mk. 1.
- Polybius.* Editionem a L. Dindorfio curatam retractavit T. Büttner-Wobst. Vol. II. 12mo. cxxi, 380 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Mk. 3.60.
- Schmitz* (J.) Die Gedichte des Prudentius und ihre Entstehungszeit. Teil I. 4to. 38 pp. Aachen. Mk. 1.
- Schoeffer* (V.) De Deli insulae rebus. 8vo. viii, 245 pp. Berlin, Calvary and Co. 8 Mk.
(Berliner Studien für Classische Philologie IX. 1.)
- Sophocles, Aias.* Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von R. Paehler. Ausgabe A. Kommentar unterm Text 8vo. viii, 112 pp. Gotha, F. A. Perthes. Mk. 1.50.
Ausgabe B. Text und Kommentar getrennt. 2 parts. viii, 45 and 64 pp. Mk. 1.50.
— Antigone. Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von F. Schubert. 2te verbesserte Auflage. 7 cuts. 12mo. xviii, 64 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 50 Pfg.
- Stange* (F. O.) Anleitung zur Vorbereitung auf Cornelius Nepos. 12mo. vi, 90 pp. Boards. Leipzig, Teubner. 80 Pfg.
(Schüler Kommentare. Heft 2.)
- Stürenburg* (H.) Zu den Schlachtfeldern am Trasimenischen See und in den caudinischen Pässen. 17 pp. Map. 4to. Leipzig, Hinrichs. Mk. 1.
- Synnerberg* (C.) Observationes criticae in M. Minucii Felicis Octavium. 4to. 27 pp. Helsingfors. (Extract: Acta soc. scient. fennicae.) Mk. 1.50.
- Thucydides.* Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von J. Sitzler. Buch 7. Ausgabe A. Kommentar unterm Text. 8vo. viii, 119 pp. Gotha. F. A. Perthes. Mk. 1.80.
Ausgabe B. Text und Kommentar getrennt. 2 parts. 50 and viii, 68 pp. Mk. 1.80.
- Tohle* (T.) Lucretius I von 483-598. Ein Beitrag zur Kritik und Erklärung des Dichters. 4to. 28 pp. Wilhelmshaven. Mk. 1.50.
- Traut* (H.) Quaestiones Theoreticae. Particula II. Dissertatio inauguralis philologica. 8vo. 24 pp. Breslau, Köhler. Mk. 1.
(Particula I was published privately.)
- Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta recensuit A. Nauck. Editio II. 8vo. xxvi, 1022 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Mk. 26.
- Troost* (K.) Inhalt und Echtheit der Platonischen Dialoge auf Grund logischer Analyse. 8vo. 48 pp. Berlin, Calvary and Co. 2 Mk.
(Berliner Studien für Classische Philologie, IX. 2.)
- Urbini* (G.) La patria di Propezio. Studi e polemiche. 8vo. 211 pp. Torino, E. Loescher. 3 L. 50.
- Varro.* Rerum rusticarum libri III recognovit H. Keil. 12mo. x, 173 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Mk. 1.50.
- Virgil.* Aeneis. Cum dilectu variae lectionis edidit E. Ladewig. Editionem II, curavit et multifariam auxit P. Deuticke. 8vo. xii, 304 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. Mk. 1.50.
- Wagner* (A.) De Syntaxi Propertiana. Passau, 1888. 47 pp.
- Xenophon.* Memorabilia. Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von A. Weidner. 12mo. xii, 170 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 80 Pfg.
- Zimmerer* (H.) Declamatio in Lucium Sergium Catinam. Maximilians-Gymn. zu München. 80 pp.